DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 715 HE 006 640

AUTHOR	Pfnister, Allan O.
TITLE	Trends in Higher Education in the United States. No. 6. Implications for Undergraduate Colleges. A Review of Recent Literature. A Report to the Commission on the Future, the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America.
INSTITUTION	Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 75
NOTE	93p.; For related documents see, HE 006 640-645
AVAILABLE FROM	Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, 955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Suite 4500, North Building, Washington, D.C. 20024. ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Church Related Colleges; Curriculum Development; Educational Finance; Enrollment Trends; Governance; *Higher Education; *Literature Reviews; Private Colleges; Students; *Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*Commission on the Future; Lutheran Educational Conference of North America

ABSTRACT

The Lutheran Education Conference of North America established its Commission on the Future in 1972 and developed a series of proposals for projects that would result in documents useful for planning among the colleges related to the Lutheran Church. At the request of the Commission an overview of the current status of higher education in the United States reflected in the contemporary literature was drawn up. In addition, the commission requested that this overview be particularly directed to the implications for planning for the Lutheran colleges. The supporting documents for this report are the five monographs that review recent developments in American higher education in terms of enrollment, students, governance, instructional programs, and finance. This document attempts to relate the general findings of the review of the literature to the 45 institutions affiliated with the American Lutheran Church, Lutheran Church in America, and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod; and concentrates on the implications drawn from the literature for the future of private and church-affiliated institutions of higher education. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED112715

TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

NO. 6 IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES
(A Review of Recent Literature)

A Report to
The Commission on the Future

THE LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

Allan O. Pfnister
University of Denver

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Allan O. Pfnister
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

March, 1975

HE006640

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America
955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W. Suite 4500 North Building Washington, D.C. 20024

Preface

This is one of six monographs written during the period covering the latter half of 1974 and the first months of 1975 and that review developments in American higher education through the mid-1970s. The sources have been articles and books published in large part between 1964 and 1975. Writing during this period has been voluminous, augmented in the last five years by the many reports, staff studies and other project prompted by, or related to, the work of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The output has been so great that it is difficult for the college administrator, much less a faculty member involved in his own discipline, to view the literature in any broad perspective.

When the Lutheran Education Conference of North America established its Commission on the Future in 1972, it developed a series of proposals for projects that would result in documents useful for planning among the colleges related to the Lutheran Church. One of the resources requested by the Commission on the Future was an overview of the current status of higher education in the United States as that was reflected in the contemporary literature. In addition, the Commission requested that this overview be particularly directed to the implications for planning for the Lutheran colleges.

In early 1974 I was asked to undertake this particular phase of the work of the Commission. After the Commission approved a preliminary outline, and after I had completed certain other commitments, including meetings in Germany and Switzerland in June, 1974, I turned to the development of these monographs. I had considered assembling the materials in a single and fairly brief report. As the writing progressed, however, it became obvious that I would not be able to complete the work, at least to my satisfaction, in a single document. After making several revisions in the format, I decided on six monographs, five of which would deal with general topics, and the sixth of which would focus upon the colleges related to the

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. The Commission on the Future reviewed drafts of four of the monographs in October, 1974 and approved the continuation of the work.

The six monographs are being issued under the general title of Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature. The titles of the six monographs are:

No. 1 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Enrollments

No. 2 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Students in the 70s

No. 3 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Governance (Organization and Administration)

No. 4 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Instructional Programs

No. 5 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Financing the Program

No. 6 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Implications for the Predominantly Undergraduate Church-Related Institution

The monographs, while each of them is fairly lengthy, do not pretend to present an exhaustive analysis of all of the literature that has been produced. The selection of books and articles from which the material is drawn was arbitrary. These are the items considered by the author to be of significance and that were readily accessible to him and that would appear to be readily accessible to those who would be using the monographs. Each monograph provides a substantial cross-section of the writing and opinion on each of the topics. The sixth monograph draws upon the preceding five monographs and attempts to outline specific implications for planning for predominantly undergraduate church-related institutions. It will be noted that, and this is particularly the case for the most recent information, the monographs draw heavily upon the Chronicle of Higher Education. The Chronicle provides the

most up-to-date references on the items covered; some of the references are taken from issues in December 1974 and January 1975.

--Allan O. Pfnister
Professor of Higher Education
University of Denver
January 1975

Current Trends: Implications for Planning

The supporting documents for this report are the five monographs which review recent developments in American higher education in terms of enrollment, students, governance, instructional programs, and finance.[1] In the pages that follow we shall attempt to relate the general findings of the review of literature to the 45 institutions affiliated with the American Lutheran Church, Lutheran Church in America, and the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

In suggesting implications, we do not assume that each of the 45 institutions will be affected in quite the same way. The 45 institutions, although having in common an affiliation with a Lutheran Church body in North America, still differ considerably among themselves. These differences are much more clearly indicated in the companion reports prepared for the Commission on the Future by Dr. Donald M. Mackenzie and Dr. Frank Gamelin. On the basis of detailed information about each of the institutions derived from reports prepared for the Federal Government and from questionnaires directed to the several institutions, Dr. Mackenzie and Dr. Gamelin have been able to provide considerable insight into the nature of the higher educational "system" of the American Lutheran Church bodies. Indeed, for this particular report to speak most directly to the trends as they relate to the 45 colleges, it would have been desirable to have had available in full the reports of Dr. Mackenzie and Dr. Gamelin as this essay was being prepared. Their reports, however, are being issued at the same time as this report, and the manuscripts were not available when this report was prepared. There were available,

however, two earlier surveys completed for the Lutheran Education Conference of North America.[2] Also made available to the writer were the computer summaries of information on enrollments and financing for 1971, 1972 and 1973.

When the study which led to this particular report was proposed, it was anticipated that some additional questionnaires might be sent to the 45 institutions. However, in the light of the data already collected by Dr. Mackenzie and Dr. Gamelin, and mindful of the constraints of time and resources, we decided in this series to concentrate entirely upon general published material and on drawing implications that appear to relate to the kinds of institutions represented in the data reflecting the status of these institutions in 1970 and 1971. This report concentrates on what the writer considers to be the more significant implications for the 45 colleges to be drawn from a fairly comprehensive review of recent publications about higher education in North America.

What Is the Future for the Private and Church-Affiliated Institution of Higher Education?

If one were to base conclusions regarding the present importance and future possibilities of private higher education solely on the relative proportion of enrollment these colleges maintain within higher educational institutions as a whole, one could become rather pessimistic. As Carol Shulman has observed, private institutions have been dropping back by about one percent per year in the proportion of the total degree-credit students enrolled for the last 20 years.[3] Indeed, if we were to use 1951 as a base year, we would find that at mid-century enrollment in private higher educational institutions was slightly more than that in public institutions, that private higher education accounted for slightly more than half of the total collegiate enrollment. In the 25 years that have passed, the proportion of enrollment in

private institutions has actually decreased by more than 25 percentage points, because in 1975 private higher educational institutions account for between 22 and 23 percent of the degree-credit enrollment.

If we were to project current trends to the year 2000, we would expect private higher education to constitute a very small part of the enrollment. But, of course, in spite of the decreasing proportion that private college and university enrollment constitutes of the total college and university enrollment in the United States, between 1951 and 1975 the number of persons enrolled in private higher educational institutions has almost doubled. However, it is sobering to note that during the late 1960s and early 1970s, there were years in which the reported enrollment count among private higher educational institutions was numerically somewhat lower than the year before. It appears that for private institutions the rate of growth has fallen significantly; perhaps it is reaching a plateau of sorts. For Protestant colleges, as one segment of the private sector, a leveling-off may already have been reached. On the basis of data for 1967 and 1970, there appears to have been a decrease in the number of students enrolled in Protestant colleges, although the decrease was on the order of less than one percent.[4]

Yet, in spite of the fact that private higher educational institutions are claiming a decreasing proportion of the enrollment and have even experienced a slight numerical decrease, private higher education still is viewed as a critically important element in higher education in the United States. In many respects the free standing private foundation, based upon the British collegiate model but carried forward with greater vigor, is a unique kind of postsecondary educational enterprise. Virtually every report and survey of higher education in recent years in the United States has stated that it is important to maintain a dual system (public and private) in the United States. The point is made by the Carnegie Commission:

> Neither quantitative measures nor lists of distinctions tell the real importance of the private sector to American higher education. The presence of the private sector has added to the range of diversity and potential for experimentation in American higher education. Because of the interaction of public and private segments, higher education in the United States has been a more dynamic evolving force, and as a system, has avoided many of the major bureaucratic problems so frequently inherent in more centralized systems.[5]

The necessity of maintaining a strong private sector is noted in a number of the Carnegie Commission reports. Similarly, the National Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States affirms the important role of private higher education:

> In the states that have acted to provide direct or indirect aid to private colleges and universities, the primary justification has been that, without such aid, private institutions would no longer be able to compete for students against heavily subsidized public institutions. Private institutions would thereby lose their ability to provide a diversity of educational experience and to serve students who would otherwise attend tax-supported public institutions.[6]

Such statements could be multiplied.

Perhaps Carol Shulman best summarizes the general attitude toward private higher education in her brief review of the present conditions and future prospects of the private college, when she notes that leaders in both public and private sectors have asserted that private higher education makes two major contributions, first, in providing "variations in size, philosophy, curricula, and communal feeling that are not generally available in public colleges" and secondly, in providing by the simple fact of its existence "a preventive pressure against excessive self-governmental interference in the academic life of public colleges."[7] Fred Hechinger is somewhat of the same mind, although presents a more guarded view. He notes, on the one hand, that the private sector can no longer claim as a reason for its continued existence "academic superiority or even social and economic leadership position," since the peaks of academic excellence "today include private and public institutions in almost equal proportion." On the other hand, he writes:

> Yet a historic view of higher education, both in the United States and abroad, argues strongly for the continued importance of private institutions. Although by no means immune, the private universities are far less vulnerable to vindictive and anti-intellectual, or merely foolish, interference by legislatures. They are less exposed to faddish public pressures. They have generally established a better, though far from perfect, record of resisting such abominations as loyalty oaths or other political efforts and indimidation. They can be hurt by political retribution, but not so fatally as the public institutions.[8]

A more recent issue of Change invited four persons to respond to the question "How shall private higher education be saved? Or should it be? All four were, however, either associated with private institutions or were involved in working closely with such institutions, and all were either convinced of the need for the continuation of the private sector and/or optimistic that it would survive even its present time of troubles.[9]

Carol Shulman refers to both the Keeton and Pace reports in the Carnegie series.[10] Both writers find that in spite of the pressures toward conformity, private higher educational institutions do provide a certain measure of diversity and distinctiveness for higher education as a whole. Using the data collected by the American Council on Education study of entering college freshmen, and in particular the data for 1967, Keeton has written that the students in the private college generally had "higher high school grade averages, more scholastic and creative accomplishments on record, and more leadership experience within the school context."[11] He also noted that the private college freshman was more likely to have more highly educated parents, come from families of businessmen and professionals with higher than normal income, and that in the area of aspirations and previous experiences the private colleges had a distinctive student body. Keeton argued that some of the data he reviewed suggested that "there is an abnormally high tendency among private college freshmen to explore, to delay or suspend judgment, and to choose life work in which exploration and suspension of judgment are effective behavior."[12]

Pace's later report on diversity found certain emphases on science, religion, and intellectuality stronger among certain denominational liberal arts colleges and highly selective liberal arts colleges.[13] In his study of the denominational colleges, Pace is of the opinion that many of these institutions will survive and perhaps prosper, particularly two types, the stronger liberal arts colleges with an earlier denominational orientation and the strongly evangelical and fundamentalist colleges. He questions the survival rate of those colleges that have neither a national reputation nor particularly strong support from the churches. He describes some of them as having "tepid environments" and wonders how much sympathy, public or private, they will be able to rally for their support.[14]

The widely quoted story in the Chronicle of Higher Education in August, 1974, revealed that 50 private colleges had closed during the 70's, that 15 had merged with other institutions and that five had become public institutions.[15] These data were developed by Eldon T. Smith of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities. It should also be noted, as Carol Shulman observes, that during the same period of time 26 new private institutions had been established.[16]

The purpose of this introduction is not to plead the cause nor to assess the comments of others who have judged one way or the other regarding the future of private higher educational institutions, but I must state that I am neither prepared to accept the gloomy predictions of some who see virtually little in the way of private higher education by the year 2000, nor am I prepared to ignore the fact that some private institutions now in existence will probably have disappeared by the year 2000. We do need to remind ourselves that the future of private higher education is being debated and that the scene has been shifting, but that in the final analysis, survival and/or flourishing will be determined by a very complex set of factors. The 43 colleges affiliated

with the three Lutheran church bodies in North America are individually facing different kinds of situations.

It should be noted that a clear distinction between public and private higher education is probably more a factor of the Twentieth Century than before. As I have noted in another publication, the earliest foundations were a mixture of public and private concerns, and throughout the 19th Century, even after the passage of the Morrill Act, "public" and "private" very often had little distinctive meaning. Cornell University was created, as was Purdue, through a combination of public and private funds. Institutions such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Yale and Harvard for a short period of time received land-grant funds. It was with the emergence in the Twentieth Century of state systems of education and the greater involvement of the federal government that the distinction between public and private seemed more clearly to emerge.[17]

The distinction between private and public higher education is, however, a complex one. Many private institutions receive tax monies directly or indirectly, and few can claim to perform an exclusively private function in the sense of having little relation to the general public welfare. John Silber, President of Boston University, has recently commented that it is inappropriate for one segment of higher educational institutions to refer to itself as private, for there is only public higher education--a public service performed by both private and government-sponsored institutions. He has urged that the terms "independent" and "state-supported" be used rather than public and private.[18] Perhaps not all are willing to go as far as President Silber, but there is much in what he has to say. The challenge to church-related colleges is to maintain a certain distinctiveness while still acknowledging the broader role which is that of preparing men and women to work for the greater public good.

I. Enrollments

The final report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education characterizes the 1970s as a time during which higher education has moved "from golden age to time of troubles."[19] Two new developments during the late 1960s and early 1970s are likely to have long-term consequences for higher education in the United States. In the first place, there has been a striking change in population trends, declining birth rates and in 1972 the lowest actual number of live births in 27 years. By the end of 1973 it was reported that American women were having only 1.9 children each, insufficient to replace the present population.[20] In the second place, there has been an apparent shift in attitude toward college going, whereby the college-going rate has slowed and may even decline. The declining birth rate and the decreasing proportion of the traditional age group enrolling in college "will obviously not in themselves account for all of the changes that will take place in higher education in the next three decades...(since) the value society places on advanced education, the availability of financial resources, the perceived needs of society...will also influence the directions colleges and universities will take...(yet the) numbers of students who finally enroll will always establish the context within which institutions must develop strategy and will set the parameters within which change will be effected."[21]

Higher education in the United States has experienced an almost continuous growth pattern since its establishment with the founding of Harvard in 1936, and planning among higher educational institutions has generally been based upon the assumption that continuing growth is inevitable. Faced with a future in which growth no longer seems quite as inevitable, some new basis for planning is needed. And while some may argue over whether we are just entering or are well into the "steady state," most writers are convinced that in the

years ahead, at least through the year 2000, we are not likely to experience the same kind of growth pattern that characterized the late 1950s and the decade of the 1960s.[22]

Leslie and Miller perhaps summarize the situation best:

> In a few words, we may characterize higher education as having undergone a period of rather marked decline in rate of enrollment, with the two-year institutions and technical schools faring best, and the small, private, sectarian institutions faring worst. However, even those institutional types with the soundest enrollment postures are faced with the necessity to economize and recruit vigorously to maintain the satisfactory margin in the face of severe inflationary pressures.[23]

And while there are variations among institutions, and undoubtedly variations among the 45 Lutheran institutions, all are being affected in one way or another by the new condition of "steady state."

Briefly, to summarize what the first monograph in this series develops in greater detail, all of the evidence points to a decrease in the pool of students from which college enrollments are traditionally drawn. By convention we have become accustomed to think of persons within the ages of 18 to 21 years or 18 to 24 years as the "college age" groups, and most projections of enrollment refer to these groups or work with ratios applying one or the other of the age groups. The majority of college students have fallen within this range in the past, but while definitive data are not readily available for any extended span of time, there are some indications that the average age of persons attending college is increasing. In 1968 some 78.7 percent of students enrolled were between the ages of 18 to 24 years, while in 1971 this percentage had fallen to 76.8 percent. And in 1968 some 17.1 percent of the students were 25 years or older, while in 1971, 19.7 percent were 25 years and older.[24] Another report, dealing only with resident rather than total students, indicates that in 1947 persons 25 to 34 years of age constituted 18 percent of the enrollment, while in the fall of 1972 they constituted 22 percent of the resident enrollment.[25]

These data indicate that predictions of enrollment can not be based solely upon the 18 to 24 age group, since an increasing number of students come from older age groups. And it is for that reason that some writers are pointing to an expanding rather than a contracting college-going pool. But before referring to the nature of this expanding pool, may we note briefly what is happening to the traditional 18 to 24 year group. Insofar as the Lutheran colleges draw from this particular pool--and it appears that they draw heavily from it--their future enrollments will be quite dependent upon what happens to this age cohort.

Neither the 1970 nor the 1971 LECNA report provides information about the age distribution of students in these colleges.[26] The computer printouts of enrollment data for the Lutheran colleges for 1973 are not much more helpful, although the fact that over 98 percent of the students are undergraduates and over 90 percent are full-time students would suggest that most of the students enrolling in these colleges fall within the more traditional age range of students. If such in the case, then whatever is happening to the pool of students within the traditional age range will have significant impact upon the planning of these 45 colleges.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census has developed sets of projections on birth rates through 1992-93. One set of projections, Series D, assumed an upturn in the birth rate in the late 1970s. However, as more information became available regarding the continuing decline of the birth rate during the early 1970s, two new sets of projections, Series E and Series F were developed, with the assumption of a fertility rate of 2.1 and 1.8, respectively. By the end of 1973, as we have already noted, it was reported that American women were having only 1.9 children each, insufficient to replace the present population. The most conservative estimates of the Bureau of the Census no longer seem unrealistic. Based upon these new projections, it appears that the number of 18-year-olds will continue to increase slightly each year during the late 1970s

until 1980, but beginning in 1980 the number of 18-year-olds will decrease, and based on the data now available, it seems clear that the number will decrease through 1992.

In short, it seems clear that the number of persons 18 years old will reach the highest level in 1979 and then begin to decrease.[27] Indeed, by 1985, there will be fewer 18- to 21-year-old persons than there were in 1972. Accordingly, in sheer number, the pool of students from which the Lutheran colleges appear to be drawing most of their students, which has been increasing each year, will decrease significantly beginning in 1980. For any of the Lutheran colleges currently experiencing enrollment dropoff, unless some new factors enter, the situation should become even worse in the 1980s.

But, some writers suggest that a continuing increase of the proportion of persons enrolling in college will offset in part the decrease in the actual number of persons in the potential student pool. There has been an almost regular increase in this proportion in the past. From 1870 to 1970 the ratio of 18- to 21-year-old persons to the total enrollment has increased from 1.7 to 47.6 The Carnegie Commission has projected an increase in the ratio to 59.2 in 1980, to 67.4 in 1990 and to 72.6 in the year 2000.[28] But even with the increase in proportion, the Carnegie Commission now predicts that in the fall of 1990 there will be a smaller total enrollment in U.S. colleges and universities than in the fall of 1980.[29] And, there seems to be some evidence that even these estimates of the Carnegie Commission may be too optimistic. A number of recent reports of the Bureau of the Census suggest that the ratio of 18- to 21-year-olds to the total enrollment has declined. Based upon slightly different figures, one report shows a slight decline in the proportion of college-age youth attending college between 1968 and 1971 (from 54.8 to 53.1), but an even more striking change between 1971 and 1972,

(from 53.1 percent to 48.8 percent.) There has been a decline for both male and female, but the decline has been especially sharp for the male, down from 62.3 percent in 1968 to 57.4 percent in 1971 and 52.4 percent in 1972.[30]

Thus, to the extent to which the 45 Lutheran colleges depend heavily upon the traditional pool of students, and such seems to be the case, the competition for college-age students will undoubtedly grow in the decade to come. There simply will be fewer students in the pool and more institutions seeking to enroll them. Unless in some way a college can change the pattern of its enrollment, or unless it has so well established itself within a particular clientele, it can not but experience decreased enrollments in the decade to come.

The problem becomes even more pressing when one reviews the data collected by Humphrey Doermann, Director of Admissions of Harvard College from 1961 through 1966. In 1968 he published a study in which he sought to establish a correlation between SAT scores and family income and then to predict from among the total high school graduates how many could be included in a particular cohort based on academic ability and financial level. His reasoning was that institutions could then estimate the pool from which their particular group of entering students might be drawn. Using data from the Educational Testing Service and the College Entrance Examination Board, he developed some estimates of the proportion of high school graduates within each of the several levels of the SAT scores. Then, employing census data, he estimated the proportion of families within each of several income levels. His next step was to relate these two sets of data in order to indicate the proportion of individuals who would fall within a certain range of SAT scores and whose families were located within a certain income level. The data are more fully explained in the monograph on enrollments.[31]

Using a correlation coefficient of .4, for which he musters a fair amount of evidence, between SAT score and income, Doermann makes some projections regarding the number of students with a particular family income and SAT score. Thus, for a college locating its potential entering class among high school graduates of 600 verbal SAT whose parents can be expected to contribute at least $4,000 to college expenses, according to Doermann, in 1974-75 there were probably only 44,000 to 68,000 men and women available. (The larger figure is based upon a correlation of .7 between income and SAT score, a figure Doermann considers entirely too high.) And it should be recognized that most of the persons within such a category have traditionally been college attenders, and for any given institution to increase its share of this particular pool will be difficult. The pool will go up slightly until 1979, but will begin to decline in 1980. A recent report suggests, however, that the number of students found in the higher ranges of the SAT scores has "dropped dramatically since the mid-1960's."[32] The number of high school seniors who scored above 500 has dropped each year in the last three years.

All of this indicates that for postsecondary institutions responding to the more traditional clientele, the pool of available students is leveling off and will decrease numerically in the 1980s. If the proportion of 18- to-19-year-olds entering college during the year of their high school graduation continues to decline, as it appears to be doing in 1972, 1973 and 1974, the pool will decrease dramatically, and enrollments in institutions depending on this age group can not but decrease. On the other hand, if such institutions are prepared and able to admit students of lower SAT scores and of lower socioeconomic status (and greater financial need), the pool of available students will at least remain fairly stable. As one observer suggests, "any college can plan successfully, if perhaps not cheerfully, to educate a less able class."[33]

For academic year 1974-75, for Lutheran colleges in general, the enrollments appear to have declined. According to statistics gathered by the Lutheran Council in the U.S.A., Office of Research, Statistics and Archives, there was a decline in enrollment in church-related colleges of 1.5 percent from 1973-74 to 1974-75. These figures were based upon enrollments reported by 36 four-year colleges, in which the full-time enrollment decreased numerically by some 734 students. Enrollments in two-year schools had remained fairly stable, and enrollments in the seminaries held fairly steady.[34] While there are variations among institutions, enrollments among Lutheran colleges have already begun to decline.

What does this mean for future planning? For those colleges that have a well-established clientele and who are managing to maintain a fairly stable enrollment at this point, it is likely that they will continue in a more or less steady state in the years ahead, although beginning in 1980 they will experience greater competition for students. For those colleges with a less clearly defined clientele, those already experiencing some measure of decline, the next few years will be even more difficult.

Colleges can expand or at least maintain their pool of students by decreasing academic requirements and accepting students with less in the way of financial resources. In the case of the latter group, however, this only means that the institutions will have to secure additional funds to subsidize to an even greater extent the students who will be enrolling. Unless there are significant changes in state and federal funding, most of the colleges will be unable to secure these funds. All of which suggests that if the colleges have not already begun to do so, they must examine much more realistically enrollment projections, develop new strategies to reach students who would be interested in, able to profit from, and able to pay for the kind of education they are providing. Business as usual simply will no longer be possible.

The situation in the late 1970s is vastly different from that during the decades of the 1960s. The LECNA study of 1970 indicated an overall growth of 54 percent in enrollment between 1960 and 1970. One institution showed an increase of 365 percent and some had doubled their enrollment during that period of time.[35] The two-year colleges had done even better, increasing by 77 percent as a group, although three showed a decrease. The 1971 supplement, however, may have provided something of an indication of that might be forthcoming, since between 1970 and 1971 there was virtually no increase in the overall enrollment, and the junior colleges actually decreased by 7 percent.[36]

What are the possibilities of increasing the college-going pool? A number of reports in the mid-1970s began to refer to the so-called "new student." Howard Bowen of the Claremont Schools, among others, argued that most of the assumptions regarding the downward trend in future enrollments were based on unduly narrow views of enrollment potentialities. He called instead for "diversified education with low fees and liberal student aid, offered at convenient times and places and catering to many different classes and backgrounds."[37] He suggested that there were many untapped sources and that if they were willing to do so, colleges could develop a broader constituency than ever before served. The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education refers to a "noncollegiate sector," and "other postsecondary schools" as well as "other learning opportunities" and suggests that within these learning situations some two million persons are already being served, and more can be served.

Whether they are motivated by the desire to maintain enrollments or to serve a constituency hitherto unserved or only partially unserved, some American higher educational institutions are beginning to respond to the urging of study commissions and an increasing number of writers that more attention be

given to other clienteles. These potential sources of new students appear to fall into two categories: (a) those within the traditional age range (18 to 21 or 18 to 24) who for reasons of scores on aptitude tests or class standing were hitherto not considered admissible, (b) those persons classified as older adults, whether capable of attending full-time or part-time, on-campus or off-campus. Patricia Cross, in articles and monographs, has provided a comprehensive overview of persons of the first group, and the Commission on Non-Traditional Study has pleaded the case of the older adult.[38]

To what extent are the Lutheran colleges prepared to deal with the first group, the low-achievers? As Patricia Cross has noted, the evidence is clear that when low levels of academic ability, aptitude and achievement are combined with low socioeconomic status, the changes of a person entering college are vastly lowered. For example, only nine percent of the males in the lowest quarter of both ability and socioeconomic status in the 1961 TALENT sample entered college, while 90 percent of the upper quarter on both characteristics enrolled in college in the fall following graduation.[39] It would appear that there is a significant pool of students within this lower ability lower socioeconomic group.

What happend if the new student is admitted to college? One of the first and obvious consequences is that if the new student is from the low-income segment, whatever the ability level, he will require significantly larger amounts of student aid. Many of the Lutheran colleges, with student aid budgets already strained, will be unable to find increased enrollments from this segment. But even if they are able to admit these "new students," an institution admitting them will have to provide more than the typical remedial or compensatory programs. As Cross observes, "for those students who do apply and are accepted, the college should be prepared to allocate adequate resources to provide the necessary instructional and counseling support while the fear-

of-failure pattern is replaced with a more positive self-confident approach to learning."[40] Moreover, the new students are not as interested in the strictly academic pursuits as is the case for the more traditional college-going person. To the extent to which the colleges would admit these students, to that extent they must be prepared to modify, enlarge, redevelop the curricular program.

What about the older adults? The Commission on Non-Traditional Study argued for a substantial broadening of opportunities for adults 18 to 60 years old. This would also appear to be a pool of potential students for Lutheran colleges. Yet, as these would-be students have been examined by various commissions, more than three-quarters are interested in vocational studies, and two-thirds are asking for something related to hobbies and recreation. General education in the more traditional academic sense, is sought by less than half of those in this group.[41] Even as these older students indicate interest in less traditional subject matter, they are also asking for new approaches to teaching and learning. One study indicates that adults are not interested in learning for its own sake and that they demand the kind of knowledge that can be immediately applied.[42]

These data from various studies strongly suggest that the traditional degree-credit programs are going to attract only a small proportion of the potential older adult market. While special degree programs for adults have been underway for some twenty years, hardly more than a dozen established programs have had any measure of long-term experience. Moreover many of the older adults are going to be part-time students, and a study completed in mid-1974 by the American Council on Education, reported that part-time students are a "majority group that suffers massive and pervasive economic discrimination at the hands of educators and policy-makers." Among the other observations made in the report was that colleges tend to consider part-time students "less

serious than full-time students."[43] As the editor of the proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth National Conference on Higher Education, observed, colleges will be able to pass from the present difficult times into a new era, but only if they are prepared "to become invigorating and useful to many persons formerly screened out or ignored: older learners, part-time learners, off-campus learners. These active adults have little time or inclination to adjust to the upper-middle-class youth ghetto we know as the modern university."[44]

In short, the new circumstances of the college-going market cannot be ignored. It is impossible to indicate how each institution should respond, because the response will be in terms of an institution's own history, present clientele and flexibility for change. At the very least, however, each institution needs to develop a series of plans which take into account the reality of a steady state, if not declining state. Each institution needs to consider the implications for changing the pattern of enrollments in terms of ability level and socioeconomic status. The implications for a faculty that may be accustomed to dealing with higher ability students now faced with the necessity of working with lower ability students cannot be ignored. Indeed, it becomes necessary to examine the whole question of ability in a different light. The demands upon developing stronger and more effective teaching procedures will become greater. The need for orienting faculty to the new circumstances and the new students, if a college seeks to move into a different market situation, becomes increasingly great.

II. Students in the 70's

As we suggested in the introduction to the second monograph in this series, "Students in the 70's," it seems almost inevitable that any discussion of the contemporary American college student, the student of the mid-1970s, will begin with and/or end with a reference to the 1960s.[45] Without giving it so much as a second thought, we tend to refer to today's student in terms of how much he or she is similar or dissimilar to the students in the 1960s. This is probably because at the time the 1960s seemed in so many ways to be unique. Indeed, one of the Carnegie reports, Dissent and Disruption, observed that the United States, "in the past decade, has been in greater internal turmoil that at any time since the period of the Civil War a century ago. The campuses have, in recent years, been in the greatest turmoil in all their history of over three centuries."[46]

When the comparison with the 1960s is made, the mid-1970s seem to some writers to be an almost different world. A researcher who has conducted surveys of American youth since 1967 finds in 1973 that campus rebellion has become moribund, that criticism of the universities has decreased and that college students appear to have developed greater acceptance of the requirements of law and order.[47] And there are many writers who are referring to a "new breed" of students; some are concerned that we have not so much a new breed of student as a return to an earlier and more complacent age. Indeed, as these words are being written in the early spring of 1975, I have just returned from a brief visit to Germany where the same mood seems to be prevailing. To questions about activism among students, one is met in Germany with the blunt statement that student activism is a thing of the past.

But what can we learn from the experiences of the immediate past as we attempt to plan for the future? One of the most striking lessons we should have learned is that it is dangerous to oversimplify the situation. Because

there are few outbursts to equal those of the mid- and late 1960s, some writers are prepared to overgeneralize that the revolts of the past are gone, that students are uninterested, that they have fallen back into a new conformity. The monograph which provides the supporting documentation for this portion of the report reviews a number of the studies of the events in the 1960s. If anything emerges from such a review, it is that the student's relationship to his college or university is a complex one. One study, as it sought to identify the many interpretations of causes and meaning of the protest of the 1960s, found no less than eight different categories of explanation. But even as the literature was analyzed under these eight categories, the author concluded that distinctions are never finely drawn:

> The classification does not show a systematic tendency among the interpretations of campus disturbance to favor one incerpretive group over the others. To be sure, the theories on psychological causes and on failures within higher education are the most frequently represented in the literature, and contain the greatest variation. However, authoritative sources have been included among the witnesses to each of the other theories, and, in the light of this, it is difficult to argue that the weight of scholarly opinion can be taken to suggest that one set of causes or meanings was more likely to have been concretely operative than another.[48]

The research points out that the literature on campus disturbance must be taken to show that the causes and meanings of the protest movement were many and interrelated.

In planning for the 1970s we cannot ignore the preceding decade and the happenings of the immediate past. But we should have learned that we cannot take the student population for granted, and we should certainly be less ready to say in 1974 what Clark Kerr said in 1959: "I can just see...that they are not going to press any grievances...they are going to do their jobs, they are going to be easy to handle. There aren't going to be riots. There aren't going to be revolutions. There aren't going to be many strikes."[49] We should be more aware that forces operating on the campus at any one time are exceedingly complex.

We should also have learned that whatever initially may have triggered off a particular series of events on a campus, whether the events were directly traceable to some specific problems on the campus, in general the protest did point up a wide range of serious problems to be dealt with. Perhaps the point is most clearly made in the Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, in which an entire chapter is given to the subject of university reform. The chapter points out that the events signaled "many serious weaknesses in American colleges and universities" and that recent history "has made it only too clear that the failure of the university to pursue effectively its stated goals, let alone to live up to them, has also contributed to student unrest."[50] The sentiment formed a recurring theme, and almost any of the reports dealing with campus unrest at one point or another referred to the need for on-campus changes.

In spite of the cynicism of some, it appears that a good many changes were effected during the 1960s and have had an impact upon the present organization of the university. Some of the reforms, including "pass-fail" as a substitute for regular grading, seemed to be falling out of favor, some of the more unstructured "experimental courses" are not as popular as they once appeared to be, but in other respects there are some significant and continuing differences. One report notes that college students are being treated more as adults, that faculty members are more committed to teaching, that there is more experimentation, but experimentation within the context of maintaining academic standards. It is also pointed out that changes in calendar, adoption of interim programs, the provision of more flexible ways for meeting graduation requirements, reduction of these requirements, and the greater direct involvement of students in governance are positive outcomes of the 1960s.[51]

At least in three ways, accordingly, as we complete the 1970s and look to the 1980s, we should be mindful of the complexity of the situation and be better prepared (1) to take student concerns more seriously, (2) to recognize that the disruptions did point up some significant areas for improvement and that (3) there have been some long-range consequences of the activities of the 1960s. It simply is inappropriate to dismiss the 1960s as a time that is gone and ought to be forgotten. This is not to suggest that students are poised and prepared for another round of disruptive activity, but it is to say that the place of the student in the university cannot be dismissed and that student concerns cannot be ignored. While each student generation is short, and students are by definition learners, they are not without insight and not without the ability to make positive contributions to the improvement of the teaching-learning environment. Any planning for the future should be prepared to solicit and review student opinions and concerns.

Beyond this broad generalization, are there other factors that should be taken account of in our planning? Nevitt Sanford said it in the early 1960s, but the remarks are perhaps even more appropriate in the 1970s. He observed that the results of large scale research on American college students accentuated the diversity rather than the similarity: "Probably the soundest statement that can be made about college students today is that they are highly diversified."[52] The contemporary literature refers to the great heterogeneity of American society and the consequences for having student bodies with diverse origins and values within most institutions of higher learning. Some institutions represent a more homogeneous student body than others, but it becomes abundantly clear as educational opportunity has been extended that the "typical" college student is a many-faceted individual. One must, accordingly, take with appropriate qualification generalizations that

the present student body is more quiescent, more practical-minded, more individualistic, and more inclined toward religion, religion to be interpreted in a broad and sometimes diffuse sense. Students are also characterized as wanting to become more directly involved in what is happening in their world, while at the same time being more practical minded and concerned about making the education "pay off."

How does one characterize the student of the 1970s? The popular assessment is that a degree of quiet and calmness has come to the campus, but that it is a quiet different from that of the 1950s. Students are supposed to be as committed as ever, but they are viewed as being prepared to work within the system. At the same time that they are characterized as being more concerned about their own personal interest, they are also said to be more realistic about the way in which the world and the university can be reformed.

During 1969-70 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education sponsored a survey of academic opinion involving 70,000 undergraduates, 30,000 graduate students and 60,000 faculty members. The results of the survey were reported in several publications of the Commission as well as in the Chronicle of Higher Education.[53] Among the results of the study, it was noted that two-thirds of the undergraduate students responded that they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the college, and 77 percent of the graduate students signified satisfaction with their programs. Yet, while generally satisfied overall with the college, faculty relations, relations with other students and the quality of classroom instruction, some 90 percent of the undergraduates indicated that course work should be "more relevant to contemporary life and problems." Another report suggests that there has been a change in the moral codes and "a surprising contrast" in what students view as morally right or wrong. For example, this study pointed out that more students considered it

more immoral to collect welfare when one was capable of working than it was to pay one's way through college by selling dope. And pilferage was considered more immoral than destroying private property, selling dope, interchanging partners among couples, and general disregard of the law. By 1973, the percentage of college students who disapproved of casual premarital sex had dropped from 34 percent to 22 percent and disapproval of homosexual relations had dropped from 42 percent to 25 percent. Yet in 1973 smaller proportions than earlier saw campus rebellion as a significant factor, and an increasing number of students indicated that it was morally wrong to use violence even in a good cause.[54]

At the present time the majority of students seems disinclined to advance student interest through the kind of disruption that reached many campuses during the late 1960s. But to conclude that apathy reigns, as is commonly suggested by many observers, is an oversimplification. Students have not simply returned to the spirit of the 50's; they have developed their own commitments, and they are involved in campus-wide decision-making to a greater degree than ever before. The students also have their ideals, but it would be a mistake to attribute to them more wisdom and insight than they have had in the past. There has been some tendency during the 1960s to romanticize the efforts of activist students and to attribute to them higher motives, greater intelligence, more dedication and greater insight than they deserve. To say this is not to depreciate their effort; it is simply to ask for more sense of perspective.

If any one lesson has come out of the experience of the past decade, it should be that college faculty and administrators cannot take students for granted. To those observers who have already decided that students have fallen into a new apathy, that life has settled into a dull and drab routine, and that there is little hope for a more lively future, we need to recall again the

assessment of the observers and the experts in the early 1960s. Few of them then anticipated the kind of disruptions that took place later in the decade. Even Kenneth Keniston, while he saw pressures for change in society, characterized the students in the late 1950s in terms of a lack of rebelliousness, a widespread feeling of powerlessness, a kind of primitivism with an accent upon the present, without much in the way of political involvement, but a commitment to the cult of experience.[55]

These observations are not to suggest that because campuses seem relatively quiet in the 1970s, as they did in the early 1960s, we of necessity face another series of outbreaks in the late 1970s. It is only to reiterate what we have said before, that students should not be taken for granted and that faculty and administration should make greater and continuing efforts to initiate and maintain a kind of dialogue that will make for more positive approach to the future. Particularly, individual institutions need to be more aware of the kind of students there are on the campus, the mood of a particular campus. They need to be more realistic about the interests and needs of students and the possibilities within the institution. It is all too easy to generate an image that fails to reflect the actual state of affairs. One may, for example, refer to the need for increasing selectivity of students and emphasizing a more traditional view of the liberal arts while the students being admitted are primarily oriented to practical and professional pursuits. What students are committed to and what the institution purports to be ought to be more closely related than is often the case.

In the years to come institutions will also be seeking to work out means of accommodating an increasing proportion of women students and minority students. While the proportion attending higher educational institutions from among the male white students is declining, the proportion of women and minority students has been increasing. There had been some concern that the increase

in minority students has leveled off and that a decrease may be facing institutions in the future, but recent reports suggest that minority enrollments have not yet leveled off.[56]

In the monograph on enrollment we have referred to the possibility of enrolling "new" types of students in the future--older students and students of lesser ability and lower socioeconomic status. As we noted in that monograph, however, the extent to which these students will become part of the student body of the 45 colleges to which this report is directed, remains an open question.[57] How the church-related undergraduate college will relate to these developments in the larger realm of "postsecondary education" is not clear. That there is a potential enlarged clientele among "older" adults and for programs outside of the "traditional" in terms of time, place and content, seems evident. But how a particular college will relate to this new clientele, to these new students, is very much a matter of what that institution's orientation and imagination may determine. The new clientele will not be automatically available or interested; each institution will have to seek out the new sources.

Several presentations during the Twenty-Ninth National Conference on Higher Education in March, 1974, referred to the development of the non-traditional sector and "recurrent education." James R. Goss, Director of the Center for Educational Research and Innovation, OECD, documented the growth of part-time training and evening classes in Europe. He noted that while much of the effort is being expended in "upper secondary education," in large part the effort is in industry and is in terms of an 'educational leave of absence."[58] James O'Toole of the University of Southern California outlined the need for developing opportunities for the disadvantaged, elderly, blue collar workers, middle-class men and women. He pointed out that "increasing numbers of people are demanding greater choice in the <u>form</u> of education."

They are requesting "self-mastery courses, and flexible time schedules, and on-the-job and in-the-field training." They also want "a greater range of curricular content...greater flexibility from their jobs...freedom to drop out of school and into work, out of work and into school."[59]

Alexander Mood is prepared to go farther. He predicts for the coming decades the student body of higher education will not be a selected group of high school graduates but "the entire adult population."[60] And higher education will be spread out over one's lifetime:

> Young persons will not devote full time to higher education on leaving high schools because they can learn more by getting experience in other kinds of social institutions....People must, in the future, learn throughout their lives because society and careers will be changing more rapidly; it will become less and less the case that one can select a career in his youth and expect to follow it to his retirement.[61]

He sees a life-long learning pattern, with people entering and leaving postsecondary institutions as time permits and as situations demand.

That there are new markets for new forms of postsecondary education seems unquestioned. On the other hand, what becoming involved in the new markets and in new approaches may mean is something that must be carefully considered by a college. Moving more directly into non-traditional forms and structures can have a significant impact upon the existing program, and an institution moving in new directions should be prepared to calculate the consequences. It will not be possible to maintain "business as usual" and to conduct some modest little experiments on the side. Many of the new approaches require a basic restructuring and reorientation of the institution as a whole. Such an approach is risky--and exciting. It can be successful--or disastrous. It would seem appropriate, however, for consortia or small groups within the 45 Lutheran colleges to explore together some of the new concerns and approaches. Indeed, it seems that through a consortium or a small group of institutions much more in the way of experimental approaches to attract new clientele might be feasible.

III. Governance--Organization and Administration

As we have observed in the third monograph in this series, the survey of governance (organization and administration), few topics concerned with the current state of higher education have elicited such broad ranging discussion as that of governance.[62] To no little degree it was the disruption in the operations of colleges and universities in the United States in the 1960s that brought governance to the forefront of educational discussions. In 1970, the President's Commission on Campus Unrest suggested that governance was becoming "one of the most hotly disputed topics on American campuses today."[63] But the discussion of new patterns of governance has not been restricted to the United States alone. As noted in the monograph on governance, there have been extensive changes in Canada and in Western Europe as well.[64]

To some writers the situation in the United States has reached crisis proportions. Among others, Clark Kerr has observed that the system of governance in American colleges and universities "is now in a crisis as never before."[65] But while many writers do not hesitate to apply the term "crisis" to the situation, they are by no means in agreement as to the precise nature of the crisis. According to some, the crisis lies in so broadening the bases of decision-making that needed decisions can no longer be made effectively. Others perceive the essential problem to be one of a "vacuum in central leadership" and they call for a new kind of leadership in the contemporary college and university. Others refer to the "erosion of authority." Others have referred to a tension arising between "authoritarianism" and "democracy." Still others have raised questions about the fundamental purpose and orientation of the academic enterprise. And still others call attention to the demand for greater accountability.

As one reviews the range of opinions, it seems probable that as in so much that characterizes American higher education, the crisis is not to be identified with one simple condition but with a whole set of complex and interrelated conditions; it seems sufficient that discussion is broad based enough and that sufficient numbers of new approaches are being tried that whether we are in a "crisis" or not, governance had become an issue of sufficient moment for every campus to review its own procedures and structures. And in such a review, the critical issues in the mid-1970s seem likely to be: (1) the role of students in governance; (2) the creation of structures that allow for the exercise of power and authority within the university; (3) the role of the faculty in governance, particularly as this is conditioned by the development of collective bargaining and questions of tenure; (4) the question of institutional accountability and the role of the trustees; (5) the developing state-wide coordination systems and their impact upon private higher education; and (6) the role of the president in the contemporary college or university.

The Role of Students.--It has been observed that studies of university governance before 1960 tended to ignore the impact of students on the decision-making process and that before the late 1960s students did not actually participate in the formal structure of colleges or universities except in a few marginal areas. But by the late 1960s and early 1970s the topic of the student role in governance has become a lively one. With few exceptions, the reports and analyses of the events on American college and university campuses during this period refer either to the need for greater student involvement or report on the development of greater student involvement in college and university governance. Earl McGrath refers to the current changes as "revolutionary" and contends that "hardly an institution remains untouched by the activities of students aimed at gaining a voice in major policy-making decisions."[66]

The monograph on governance refers to a number of studies that had been made in the late 1960s and early 1970s regarding the extent to which students have indeed become involved in decision-making. We shall not attempt to summarize the findings except to note that it appears that on a large number of American college campuses students appear to have become more involved in decision-making and such matters as admissions, student financial aid, planning of buildings and grounds, certain administrative appointments, and judicial regulations. They are less likely to be directly involved in evaluating administration or in budget-making. They are involved in evaluating the faculty but are generally excluded from specific personnel decisions.[67]

Faculty attitude toward student involvement presents a mixed picture. On the one hand, there are studies that seem to indicate that a fairly substantial proportion of faculty are agreeable to more student involvement as long as the student voice is a minor one. On the other hand there are other reports that suggest there is still considerable opposition on the part of faculties to broadening student participation in decision-making.

But regardless of the position that one takes about the degree of student involvement that is desirable, the fact seems to be that more students are involved in more ways in university policy matters. And in the process, one of the problems that surfaces again and again is that of how, once the commitment is made, most effectively students are to be incorporated into any particular decision-making situation. A variety of structures has emerged, most of which appear to be variations of some kind of all-institution governing body. While some studies are underway to determine the effectiveness of these all-institutional forms, the evidence so far is mixed. It appears that more students hold more positions on more faculty or general university committees than at any point in the past, and countless Commission reports

have called for further increase in student involvement. Yet, most students and faculty question whether students have had any significant impact on decision-making, and faculty are by no means united in their opinion regarding the desirability of more student involvement. How best to incorporate students into the university decision-making process, at whatever degree of involvement, remains an issue.[68] Some writers have suggested that the most promising approach is to develop better input from students at the departmental level rather than at the all-institution level.

What are the implications of the developments as we have examined thus far? First of all, it would appear that even though students are not as ready to mount the barricades in the 1970s as they were in the 1960s, they are expecting to enter more actively into policy decisions than might have been the case a decade ago. The degree of insistence will probably vary from campus to campus, but students in general expect to be consulted more often and in a wider variety of contexts. Even with a fair measure of faculty opposition, students have become more regular participants in various levels of decision-making. It is unlikely that the trend that has begun will be reversed.

Secondly, it appears that the most critical issue is that of determining how most effectively to incorporate the insights and observations of the students, particularly at the undergraduate level, into the decision-making process. The all-university approach has been far from a universal success. The bicameral approach depends upon an effective student government, and student governments have not as such managed to maintain a great deal of momentum in recent years. Relatively few institutions have sought effectively to incorporate student response in decision-making at the departmental level, but even as the department represents the basic unit within the academic structure as a whole, it would seem that the most promising point

of contact would be at the level of departmental discussion and decision-making. It is perhaps surprising that more efforts have not been made in this direction.

For the undergraduate colleges to whom these monographs are particularly addressed, we would say that whatever the prevailing mood at the moment may be, the request of students for some greater measure of involvement ought not to be lightly dismissed. Particularly in institutions that appear to be committed to a greater sense of community, to the inculcation of values and appreciation, sincere efforts at making use of student insights should be undertaken. And, we would suggest that while forms of all-university governance may be one route to follow, an even more promising approach would be to have students work more directly with faculty at the departmental level and in the structures which provide for significant departmental input into the overall institutional planning.

Broader Structures for Decision-Making.--Quite beyond seeking ways for more student involvement, the emergence of broader decision-making units represents in itself a significant development in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The variety of approaches underway is detailed in the monograph on governance. While a number of studies are underway to determine the effectiveness of such bodies, few all-university structures have been in existence long enough to provide any significant test of effectiveness. One of the more useful reports is that from a single institution, the discussion of the development of a College Council at Carleton College.[69]

As Smith describes the way in which the Council developed, he notes that three areas of contention soon emerged. The first had to do with the question of identity and of definition, i.e. just what is the particular role that students, faculty, administrators, trustees and others should severally play in determining academic policy. The second point of contention related to how

to balance positions when questions of resource allocation arose. And the third point of contention related to accountability, a concern for a more thorough evaluation of teaching, academic programs and departments, and institutional commitments.

Smith suggests that any entry into all-university type of governance is likely to elicit more or less the same kinds of concerns. There are many positive outcomes, but the process calls for many more hours of time, and one must strike a balance of sorts "between exhaustive discussion and delegation of responsibility."[70]

The evidence is far from clear, and the only conclusion to which we arrive at this point in time is the rather obvious one that no one should expect an all-university type of governance structure to solve the governance problem. Once entered into, the parties involved in an all-campus structure soon find it necessary to define and redefine roles; the work has just begun. And ultimately, some hard decisions have to be made about the appropriate balance between broad ranging discussions and clear delegation of responsibility.

Faculty Role.--The general review of new approaches to broader decision-making touches directly upon faculty participation, but since there are other issues relating to faculty role, it seems appropriate to refer to faculty participation in decision-making as a separate topic. One of the more helpful analyses of the present state of affairs is that of Burton Clark, in which he observes that the contemporary academic institution seems to represent a combination of the "collegial" and "bureaucratic." On the one hand the academy reveals decisions being made "through informal interaction among a group of peers and through a collective action of the faculty as a whole." On the other hand, the contemporary campus is complex enough to require that much of the communication is "through formal channels, responsibility is fixed in formally designated positions, interaction is arranged in relations between

superiors and subordinates, and decisions are based on written rules."[71]

What Clark sees emerging from this combination is a "professional model. That is to say, as the faculty has become more professional and as the institution as a whole reflects more of a professional orientation, the academy becomes "much more like a United Nations and much less like a small town." The university is perhaps most accurately described as a loose alliance of professional persons for which the administrative structure provides a type of coordinating function.

Studies of faculty involvement and decision-making suggest considerable commitment on the part of faculty to the principle that they should have greater impact upon the decisions being made. This is accompanied, however, with considerable reluctance to spend the time and effort required to implement the principle. In the final analysis, a relatively small number of faculty monopolize the membership of the most powerful committees, and oligarchies charaterize the machinery of faculty governance.[72]

It is into this kind of situation that issues relating to collective bargaining and tenure have been interjected in the last few years. By the middle of 1974 there were some 338 campuses on which faculty members had chosen collective bargaining agencies, 70 more institutions than were reported 18 months previously. By early 1975 some 362 campuses were organized. The major agencies involved, the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association have both committed themselves to intensive campaigns to organize college and university professors. While the process of organization seems to have slowed a bit, and the entire development is too new to be adequately assessed, it seems almost assured that the movement will continue to grow and that considerably more than the ten percent of total faculty in American colleges and universities now organized will in the years to come be involved in some kind of collective bargaining unit.

What the specific effect of collective bargaining will be on university governance is yet to be determined. Eloquent arguments have been mustered on both sides of the question, namely that collective bargaining will change radically the internal structure and that collective bargaining will enhance the present structures. Logic would suggest at the very least there will be a reorientation of structures that would make a faculty less the "quasi-independent practitioners who share managerial authority" that many consider themselves to be and establish more clearly an identifiable management group as something apart from "employees and their representatives."[73] Collective bargaining would seen logically to introduce a measure of bilateral government that must be distinguished from hierarchical authority on the one hand and professional self-government on the other. But, as one writer observes, the main problem for writers in the field is "even those scholars who know the most about faculty bargaining don't know very much as they themselves will freely admit."[74]

With regard to tenure, a major commission, the Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education reported in March, 1973. The Commission was co-sponsored by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. The Commission, perhaps not unexpectedly, came out strongly for the maintenance of the tenure system, but also acknowledged that the principle of tenure "will not long survive unless reform of its abuses and elimination of weaknesses are vigorously pursued."[75] Along with other elements of reform, the Commission appeared to suggest that a type of quota system be instituted; it referred to the necessity for each institution to formulate "a faculty staffing plan," under which "an appropriate number of tenure positions...are available for allocation to any unit where they may be needed."[76] The quota system almost immediately came under attack. In one court test, however, in the state of New Jersey the

requirement that the state's four-year and two-year colleges impose either "specific restrictions or more intensive and rigorous review procedures" in any award of tenure was upheld.[78]

The monograph on governance outlines the many arguments that have been advanced both for and against tenure and refers to a number of court cases that have recently emerged.[79] A federal judge in Wisconsin ruled that tenured faculty members who are dismissed because of university financial problems have only limited protection. An Iowa district judge held that the University of Dubuque had the right to fire a tenured professor in 1972 because of the University's financial problems. But in the Bloomfield, New Jersey case, a superior court judge ruled on behalf of the Bloomfield faculty who had been dismissed. And, in mid-1974 a district court judge ruled in favor of a group of Oklahoma college faculty who had been dismissed.

One authority, in summarizing these observations on the legal dimensions of tenure, finds what he refers to as a "paucity of definitive legal content regarding tenure," and suggests as a general principle, "once a professor has tenure, his rights should be well protected." He goes on to say, however, that there are differences in the approach of public and private institutions, that a tenure plan under a governing board of a public institution is generally considered a form of sub-legislation having the force of law, while in a private institution any right to tenure is contractual rather than statutory.[80]

We are far from reaching definitive positions on either collective bargaining or tenure, but it seems clear that both matters will continue to constitute significant issues on the college campuses. At least one of the 45 Lutheran colleges has completed a bargaining agreement. In January, 1975, the Board of Trustees of Wagner College in New York approved a contract that had been overwhelmingly ratified by the faculty in November. The contract is for a period of three years and provides for a reconsideration of salary for

the third year. Contained in the agreement are, among other points, the following: (1) all faculty appointments are for one academic year or for the remainder of an academic year; (2) departments must give reasons for recommendations relative to reappointment and promotion when requested by the faculty member involved; (3) faculty workloads are defined as "twelve contact hours of teaching each semester but not less than ten (10) contact hours a week" and hours for office time and committee service are also given; (4) the grievance procedure allows "the college" to file with the AAUP chapter President as a complaining party.[81]

While some might conclude that the colleges of the Lutheran Church are less likely to employ collective bargaining as a means of resolving salary and work conditions for faculty, the experience of Wagner College indicates otherwise. It is important that the colleges in this group examine carefully the experience of other institutions and consider the implications of collective bargaining for their own campuses. Perhaps the Washington office of the Lutheran Education Conference of North America can serve to channel information to the member institutions and to provide a forum for discussion of the issues involved. And, it would be inappropriate for any to suggest that collective bargaining is necessarily in conflict with the nature and structure of these institutions.

Private higher education became involved in collective bargaining when in June, 1970, the National Labor Relations Board, in a reversal of a previous ruling, affirmed that it had jurisdiction over non-profit colleges and universities having at least one million dollars gross revenue. Tax-supported institutions fall under the laws of the respective states, and as of early 1975 some 31 states have mandatory "meet and confer" laws; of the remaining states, four have permissive coverage, but no legislation.[82]

Regional rulings of the National Labor Relations Board in the cases of private colleges have not always been consistent. In Denver, Colorado, one ruling included department chairpersons as "management" and another ruling for a quite similar institution held that department chairpersons could be included in the bargaining unit. In March, 1975, a regional director of the NLRB stated that St. John's University is not required by law to negotiate with its faculty union over issues of campus governance.[83] But matters of governance have increasingly become elements in the bargaining process. If the New York ruling--and the full NLRB has not reviewed the case--should become more widespread, collective bargaining at private colleges could be limited to purely economic issues. But the situation is far from clear at this time. For the public sector states have been moving one-by-one, but a federal public-employee bargaining law may be in the offing; one major bill has been introduced at this time, the so-called Thompson bill (HR 77).[84]

With regard to tenure, it is almost inevitable that some of the institutions among the 45 Lutheran colleges will have faced financial exigencies that will require a review of tenured positions. Rather than wait for the crisis to appear, it would seem appropriate at this stage that each institution examine its own stand with regard to tenure, that it explore different approaches to appointment, that it be frank to acknowledge the possibility of new types of contract procedures. The better part of wisdom would be to explore alternatives before an institution is faced with the very difficult decisions of terminating tenured positions. Under law, as private institutions, the Lutheran colleges probably have considerable freedom of action. But, as colleges related to the church, and because of the kind of service expected of the faculty, something other than a strict legal interpretation of tenure needs to be explored.

With regard to the broader issue of faculty involvement in decision-making, the nature of the Lutheran institutions would suggest that while a strictly collegial structure is probably as difficult to maintain for them as for other institutions, more of the collegial system might be appropriately preserved in these colleges. Again, rather than waiting until the crisis appears, it would seem appropriate for each institution to be engaged in periodic review of governance structure. All too often, academic institutions engage in such studies under the pressure of a particular crisis, and then neglect to follow through with the continuing kind of study that can prepare the way for shifts and changes before a new crisis forces changes. Some of the Lutheran institutions have attempted new structures. We did not, however, have available for this review any reports on the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of these structures. A useful study for LECNA would be a review among the 45 colleges of specific patterns of internal governance that have developed over the last decade, an analysis of the successes and the failures, and an exchange of information among the institutions that would assist in a continuing study and audit of structural changes.

Trustees and Governance.--The 1970 LECNA study reviewed in general terms the various types of trustee structures among the 45 colleges. In that study it was reported that in the American Lutheran Church six colleges were owned by a corporation synonomous with the national convention, four were owned by one or more area conference corporations and one was owned by an associated group of congregations. One college was related both to the American Lutheran Church and Lutheran Church in America. Within the Lutheran Church in America, 17 colleges were related to one or more synods, and one college was related to the then national Board of College Education and Church Vocations. Within the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, 14 colleges were owned directly by the church-at-large but related to one or more districts, and one university was owned by

the Lutheran University Association and supported by an annual collection within the congregations of the church.

All of the Lutheran colleges were reported to be "free-standing, autonomous institutions" except for the 14 schools that are related to the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod. These 14 (ten junior colleges and four senior colleges) are in effect part of a "Concordia System," a multi-campus university with individual boards coordinated and supervised by a central Board of Higher Education.

But even within these general structures, there is considerable variation in the legal structure of the various boards. Dr. Gamelin's study will provide more specific information about the way in which these institutions are related to the various church bodies. We make mention of these general structures, however, because one of the major issues in governance that has arisen within the last few years among American colleges and universities has been that of defining the appropriate role of the board of control, (board of trustees, board of directors or board of regents). Legally, within the American system, the individual board of control <u>is the institution</u>. As one writer has indicated, "this body--the governing board, constituting a single artificial person--legally <u>is</u> the university."[85] Over the years boards of control appear to have exercised greater or lesser power in directing the courses of the institutions to which they have been related. Perhaps as much as anything, the academic freedom debates at the turn of the century and during the early years of the twentieth century served to increase the autonomy of the institution over the board. It has been suggested that until the latter part of the 1960s, with the emergence of a time of dissent and revolt, boards of control had become relatively ineffective and powerless. Such a judgment is an overgeneralization, and there are certainly exceptions to the observation, but the broad generalization has some documentation

In the early 1970s there is a new mood; there are some moves toward a reassertion of the power of the board. The annual meeting of the Association of Governing Boards in May, 1974, discussed a report based on a recent poll of 599 board chairmen. At that meeting there seemed to be "widespread agreement that trustees should assume a bigger role in handling such issues as faculty workloads, tenure, and even the content of the curriculum."[86] One speaker at the conference called for much more involvement in curriculum and faculty workloads, and said that trustees will have to become more accountable for what is happening within the institutions, with what is taught and how it is taught.

But, if trustees are to exercise their powers effectively, they will have to be reconstituted to provide for a much greater diversity of membership. As T.R. McConnel observes, membership can no longer be confined "to those who represent wealth, position or political power, but should be extended to those who represent a wide range of economic and political interests and a diverse pattern of ethnic and cultural backgrounds."[87]

Several studies have been undertaken to define the nature of board membership and the way in which boards have exercised control. These studies reveal, however, relatively little regarding how the more effective boards function, or even what constitutes an effective board. There is little question that a board has legal responsibility for the college or university it maintains, but the specific roles played by boards are far from clear. Roles probably vary greatly with the type of institution, time and circumstances. Perhaps this variability is the strength of the lay board in the American system; the board can vary its role with type of institution, time and circumstances. As collective bargaining becomes more a part of the collegiate scene, it will be interesting to see what the role of the board will become. Among public institutions the board may be bypassed in favor

of the executive or legislative offices. Among private institutions, the board will almost inevitably become the locus of last resort.

It is difficult to point up direct implications of this brief review of board structure for the 45 colleges of the Lutheran Church bodies in North America. Much more needs to be known about how effective the several boards currently are, what their concerns are, how they may more effectively relate the colleges to their constituencies. Undoubtedly considerable review of board functions will be called for in the years to come. Among other developments that will call for such a review are the various types of state and federal programs that are developing. As these programs grow, the nature of the board and the degree to which it represents a particular sectarian orientation will be matters of increasing concern. The efforts of the Lutheran Church in America to have institutions and supporting synodical organizations review their relations and establish or renew covenants would seem to us, to represent a step in the right direction.

State Coordination.--For both private and public sectors, the emergence of governing or coordinating boards in more and more states has had an impact on the day-to-day decision-making of these institutions. While statewide governing boards have restricted their efforts to the public sector, coordinating boards, still in the majority, have in some states effectively incorporated private institutions into statewide planning. In 1974, some 27 states were reported to have coordinating boards and 20 to have governing boards. Only three states do not have the equivalent of a coordinating or governing board.

The distinction between the governing and coordinating board is that the former is a legal governing and regulating agency for the institutions under its control, while in the latter various levels of review and moral and political persuasion are employed. Governing boards relate almost exclusively,

if not entirely, to the public institutions under their direction. Coordinating boards can and do relate to private institutions in various ways. A study by the Academy for Educational Development completed in the fall of 1969 observed that in 14 states the official state planning agency was charged "with some responsibility for private institutions and overall planning for higher education" and in three of the states the law stipulated that private institutions must be included. Some 15 additional state agencies indicated some degree of recognition of private institutions in their planning activities.[88] The point at which state agencies have most directly related to private institutions has been through state scholarship plans, and in 1974 there are almost 40 state scholarship or aid programs in effect.

On another level, the development of the so-called "1202 Commissions" may have an important effect upon private higher education. Section 1202 of the Education Amendments of 1972 requires any state that wants to receive assistance under Section 1203--which authorizes grants and assistance to comprehensive statewide planning--to establish a state postsecondary commission that is broadly and equitably representative of various types of postsecondary educational institutions. After a year of limited emphasis, the U.S. Office of Education decided to encourage the creation of these commissions. The U.S. Commissioner of Education wrote to all governors announcing that the Office of Education would allocate at least $1,000,000 for statewide planning grants to be administered by the 1202 Commissions. The state governors were to notify the Commissioner by April 15, 1974, if they had decided to establish a commission. The deadline was subsequently extended to April 25, and some 43 states, plus the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam and Puerto Rico are reported to have established such commissions. The 1202 Commissions can be designated as the state agency responsible for certain other federal programs. In the requirement that the 1202 Commissions be "broadly and

equitably representative of the general public and private non-profit and proprietary institutions of postsecondary education," the legislation incorporates, or would seem to do so, private higher education into statewide planning.

The implications of current developments seem fairly clear. In a surprisingly rapid manner private higher education is becoming more directly related to statewide planning and statewide programming. It seems important to us that private institutions make every effort to keep abreast of the developments, particularly the development of the 1202 Commission and the statewide planning implied by the establishment of these commissions. The commissions must be broadly representative, and that means that private institutions will and must have a voice in the development of the commissions and in the work of the commissions. It would seem to us appropriate that the private institutions take more initiative in whatever political ways are open to make their concerns felt in the establishment of these commissions. As Robert Berdahl in his 1970 study observed with regard to financing, "even if the state role in financing higher education were to diminish markedly, all institutions--public and private--would still have to function in the context of state law and state sovereignty."[89]

Presidential Leadership.--Studies undertaken in the early sixties of the college or university president placed heavy emphasis upon educational leadership. And this leadership, according to Harold Dodds was to be exercised through "informal, friendly, and persuasive means."[90] In the monograph on governance we suggest that there is a sense of unreality in such comments, especially as we have emerged from the conflicts of the late 1960s and early 1970s.[91] Studies predating the era beginning in the late 1960s present an almost idyllic picture in comparison to what has happened in the experiences of academic leaders in more recent years.

The contemporary academic leader finds himself hedged around by constraints; the traditional and constitutional limitations are compounded by the realities of the external situations, the rights and privileges of members of the academic community, the demands for team work. He finds it difficult to exercise his call to decision, and yet the leader is still called upon to decide. As John Gardner has observed, anyone who accomplishes anything of significance has more confidence than the facts would justify.[92] He notes that too many contemporary leaders are not prepared to decide, but they seem to prefer to go through a series of clearances within the organization and let the process itself settle the issue. They take polls, devise statistical systems, accounting systems and information processing systems. The leader must know the facts, or he is in trouble, but the leader must proceed with the degree of confidence that goes beyond the facts.

The contemporary leader must also be prepared to work within a context of conflict. Conflict is a way of life in the university, and the problem of leadership becomes that of accepting conflict as inevitable and finding ways of dealing with it in a constructive manner. To try to eliminate conflict is unrealistic, short of creating a wholly homogeneous unit--which, by definition, stifles diversity. The 1970 President's Institute of the American Council on Education, in stressing the need for a new type of leadership, referred to the new presidents as "Crisis Managers," and noted that "today's president must know something about new techniques of budgeting scarce resources, labor relations, the legal process, and the mediation of disputes under pressure."[93]

Various estimates have been given of the average tenure of the college president, and much publicity has been given to what appears to be a fairly short tenure of four to five years. More careful analysis, however, suggests that the average tenure is as a matter of fact a much longer period. Cohen

and Marsh examine and find wanting most reports regarding "average tenure." They conclude that during most of the twentieth century the median college president has served about ten years.[94] They also refer to the president as exercising leadership in "organized anarchy," and while recommending some steps to combat the prevailing ambiguity, conclude that the fundamental problem of ambiguity will remain as part of the president's condition of work.

While the debates will continue regarding the amount of leadership the president actually is able to exert in the contemporary university, it seems to us that the weight of the evidence is that with all of the problems and all of the demands, the president is still called upon to exert a leadership that constitutes the, or at least, one of the, deciding factors in the future of an institution. The contemporary president is hardly in the position of exerting the arbitrary leadership more characteristic of the presidents of the late 18th or early 19th centuries. He is working in a much more complex situation and is beseiged by a host of pressures and demands. He needs much more information than did his predecessors. He needs to take into account opinions and judgments of a wider range of persons, from students and faculty to board and constituency. But he must still exercise the kind of decision that does help to set the direction or maintain the direction of the institution. As is the case in every administrative position, it is all too easy to become bogged down with busy work and the inconsequential. Because of the requirement to consult and work for consensus, the contemporary president can become even more bogged down in trivia. In some way, as we read the comments on the contemporary president, the top institutional leader needs to take into account a wider range of opinion and must be prepared to receive much greater input than ever before, but he is no less responsible for the critical decisions that are necessary to maintain and direct the institution.

IV. Instructional Programs

A decade ago, writing about college and university curriculum seemed to be dominated by two major themes, the nature and structure of general education and the place of teacher education in liberal arts colleges. There was, however, a large number of sub-themes relating to the nature of the teaching-learning process. Baskin's assessment of some of the newer developments in higher education in the mid-fifties called attention to the efforts institutions were making to maintain some of the presumed values of smallness in the midst of increasing enrollments, variations on independent study, the use of new media of instruction, residence hall living in relation to climate for learning, arrangements for new calendars, possibilities in off-campus learning.[95]

By the mid-1970s, with declining or steady enrollments, less attention was being given to maintaining the presumed qualities of smallness in the midst of growth, and general education was still a factor for consideration, but not a major issue. Independent study had been expanded to include consideration of various kinds of "nontraditional" study opportunities. Somewhat less emphasis was being placed upon residence halls as centers for learning, although continuing efforts were being made. Seminars at the freshman level seemed to be receiving somewhat more attention. An incredible variety of calendar arrangements had emerged during the decade. There continues to be a significant development in off-campus experience. Inter-institutional cooperation of various styles continues, although some of the consortia developed in the 1960s have faced difficulties, and some have even dropped out of existence.

In the mid-1970s there is a certain restiveness as national and state commissions, groups of educators, legislators, and the general public call for greater accountability from the educational enterprise. While there has hardly

been a year without some kind of reform movement, the demands for educational reform in the 1970s become even more insistent. The head of a large state system insists that higher education must construct entirely new arrangements that will respond to the changing social patterns in which education is likely to become a life-long pursuit.[96]

In the midst of the frequent demands for change we find that many of the exciting "new" measures advanced in the mid-1970s were discussed in the literature more than a decade ago, that many innovations appear to be old ideas in new dress, but that the demand is no less insistent that higher education adapt to new social conditions and that a complete overhaul of academe is needed. And as one reviews documents such as An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform, we have the impression that virtually every college in the country is involved in some kind of "reform" or "innovative" program.[97] While little that is distinctively new in higher education as a whole may be emerging, at least institutions are individually experiencing what are to them new approaches. It may still be the case that, to use an outworn analogy, it is more difficult to change the curriculum than to move a cemetery, but it appears that if the cemetery is not being moved, at least a lot of extensive landscaping is underway.

The attempts at change and restructuring take on several forms, the most radical of which is the establishment of entirely new institutions. Not all new institutions are innovative. The American Council on Education in a study published in 1972 found that more than one-third of the 2,573 colleges and universities existing in 1970 had come into existence after 1947. Two-thirds of these were two-year community colleges, and over half of the new institutions had been established under public auspices. The study suggested that on an average, over the twenty-year period from 1947 to 1967 approximately 45 new institutions had been established per year. Even during the 1970s, when

between 1970 and 1974 some 50 private colleges had closed and a number of others had merged, 26 new private institutions had been established.[98]

Of the many colleges that have been established, some even during the 1970s, one may perhaps refer to some 25 as "new" or "experimental." Among these institutions, if there are any general characteristics to be found, they are the emphases upon individually developed courses and individually oriented experiences. The "new" colleges seek to provide considerable freedom for students in developing their programs.

Reviewing the status of the experimental colleges in the Chronicle of Higher Education, one writer observes that while differing among themselves, the "new" colleges still have much in common in method and philosophy and have even developed their own kind of jargon. They have a mimeographed newsletter, a "national resource center" and their own national conferences. While all claim to be "historic departures from the norm," it is contended that "many in fact are not," and that they have "precedents in other places or other times, and much of what they do is borrowed from A.S. Neill, John Dewey and even Socrates."[99] What is significant to us is that whether they are newly developed departures or borrowers from the past "they approach educational reform in a comprehensive way, going far beyond tinkering with grading systems and other piecemeal reforms." The "new" colleges seek alternatives to distribution requirements, majors, grades, lectures and attempt to provide ways for students to develop their own approaches to learning. Not all students are able to cope with the lack of structure and new freedom that some of the institutions represent, and these drop out or return to conventional programs. Most of the experimental colleges attempt also to develop some kind of community that brings students and faculty into more frequent and less formal contacts. Generally, the governance system involves wider participation in decision-making.

It is difficult for new colleges to remain new, to maintain the spirit of innovation that brought them into existence. As two participants in one of the experimental colleges observed, faculty are prone to fall back on accustomed patterns of organization; they find it difficult to develop new instructional procedures, because they are trained in conventional institutions and are "steeped in the conventional processes and rationales of liberal education."[100] The students also rarely come equipped with the skills for dealing with the kind of freedom the new institutions want to foster. Another observer found among the new institutions a tendency to move to more formal and stable organization structures, toward clearer definition of roles and functions.[101] He found that many features of the institutions were threatened constantly by both faculty and student orientation, and he generalized that "the most influential general factor in opposing the development of innovative educational environments is the traditionalism of the attitudes and beliefs of the constituents of the innovative institutions." In short, the internal parties--faculty, students, administration--generally prove to be their own worst enemies.

Among the Lutheran colleges, apart from the development of the specialized senior college at Ft. Wayne for theological students, there have been no new institutions as such developed in recent years. The Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod has established two junior colleges in the Concordia System since 1960, and the American Lutheran Church, with the participation of the Lutheran Church in America, established California Lutheran College in 1959. But as these institutions have developed, they are more in the line of the institutions within whose tradition they were established.

If there is any general lesson to be learned regarding the establishment of "new" colleges that are experimental in nature, it is that any great deviation from the mainstream is difficult to maintain. Several of the

experimental colleges have already disappeared from the scene. Bensalem closed its doors after some three or four years of existence. Prescott College is on the verge of closing, and New College in Florida has become part of the state system. Those which have survived, and there are many, find themselves accommodating in many ways to the more traditional patterns. Yet, the net result may be an institution that is still somewhat different from the mainline institutions that has through the innovations developed and modified, influenced other and more traditional institutions. Robert Altman, in reviewing the experience of one new upper-division college, noted that it had:

> eventually discovered what many other experimental programs involving the structure of education had discovered: that a single institution, regardless of the degree to which it is internally satisfied with an organizational structure different from that of those institutions with which it interacts, cannot continue to operate under those conditions if the other institutions (or accrediting bodies or athletic conferences) do not make certain necessary adjustments.[102]

One is tempted to incorporate this statement into a form of a law of change, so universal does its application seem to be. The pressures toward conformity, whether a program proves itself or not, are strong.

A second approach to the change or reform of the instructional program is either through the introduction of special programs to alter in significant ways the institution as a whole or to create units within the parent institution to permit and/or encourage new approaches to teaching and learning.

The classic examples of institutions being transformed through the introduction of new elements are Antioch College and its work-study program, St. John's College and the great books, Parson's College (now closed) and its "second chance" curriculum, Colorado College and the modular course structure, Beloit and its combination of on- and off-campus work, Goshen and the Study Service Term. What all of these "transformed" colleges have in common is that

an existing institution, more or less traditional, has through the introduction of significant change in calendar, or instructional technique, or program, experienced more than simple addition in programming. The college as a whole has been influenced by the introduction of the new element, and the environment of the college has been sufficiently changed to make it a new kind of enterprise. Not all of the transformations "take," and not all of those that do "take" are viewed as unqualified successes. Yet, the advantage of instituting significant changes within an existing institution is that there is a base from which to operate, and the changes themselves can be modified in the light of experience. The established institution generally has enough momentum to carry it through the dislocations and frustrations of the new programs.

Perhaps more popular than attempting to change the institution as a whole have been the efforts to create new units within existing institutions. These are often referred to as "colleges within a college." These are discrete programs with an identifiable faculty and an identifiable student body. While faculty and students may also participate in other work in the parent college, they can be clearly identified with the college within the college, and faculty usually devote most of their teaching efforts to the special unit. In most cases also the college-within-a-college has separate budgetary and administrative support.

We are able to identify some 25 units or clusters of units within larger institutional settings. One on our list, Bensalem of Fordham, lasted nearly six years. The first class of 30 students was carefully selected on the basis of intellectual and personal standards. The college was designed to be self-directive, liberal, self-evaluative. It was to operate on the basis of group consensus, but one of the problems was that consensus was never easily reached, and the self-selective nature of the college tended to isolate it from the rest of the university and finally led to its termination.

On the other hand, one of the units established in a Lutheran college, the Paracollege of Saint Olaf, recently concluded its experimental period by being incorporated into the college as a separate unit of something more than departmental stature. In 1968, the faculty of Saint Olaf College, in response to many of the same kinds of concerns that were surfacing on many campuses, authorized the establishment of what came to be called the Paracollege. The Paracollege was to provide opportunities for those who found the more conventional patterns of course requirements and course structure restrictive, or as some were wont to say, irrevalent. The new unit was established to be a part of the campus community in which any idea could be considered and could be put to the test. Implicit in the agreement to establish the Paracollege was the intention to incorporate into the main or regular college such procedures and practices as might prove desirable after trial in the Paracollege. In this way, the Paracollege was to be the initiating and innovative unit.

In the course of a special review of the Paracollege, during 1973-74, an all-college committee concluded that the program should be given the status of a continuing unit, on par with any other department or unit in the parent college. In one sense this changed the direction of the Paracollege, for instead of remaining the experimenting unit feeding new ideas into the regular college, the Paracollege gained a life of its own as an alternate route for students admitted to Saint Olaf.

Valparaiso University has established Christ College. This college shares the general purposes of Valparaiso and expects the student to complete most of the regular graduation requirements, including a major. It does permit, however, students to develop special majors and concentration sequences. A special freshman-sophomore program emphasizes the humanities, and some studies are aimed at developing a theology of life and vocation. Some variation in the instructional program is provided through semi-tutorial and independent

study opportunities. Persons completing their work in the college are required to submit a final Bachelor's Essay.[103]

While the other Lutheran colleges have introduced new types of sequences within the regular structures, Saint Olaf and Valparaiso are apparently the only institutions that have moved to an experimental type program. Of the two, the Paracollege at Saint Olaf represents, it seems to us, an attempt to develop on a long-range basis more sweeping changes while still maintaining something of a coherent unit. But even the Paracollege has compromised some of its earlier plans. The governance of the unit was to be as experimental as the curriculum. After several years of experience, it was determined that the governance pattern should move back to more of a departmental structure, with considerably more authority and responsibility delegated to the head of the Paracollege.

The dilemma that any innovative unit within an institution faces is that of trying to maintain the sense of innovation while at the same time recognizing the value of aspects of the program that have been tested and found useful. That is to say, in one sense the most successful experimental unit is one that is under almost constant change; the program of one year is always somewhat different from that of the preceding year. On the other hand, some of the innovations (innovations in terms of the institution's experience) are found to be useful and worthy of adoption. But, the more successful the experimental unit is, the more likely it is to become an established, if alternate, route for students in the institution. Such was the case with the Paracollege. The development of the interdisciplinary majors, the colloquia and other instructional forms, responded to positively by faculty and students, seemed to be patterns that ought to be repeated. The Paracollege thus became another established program. It seems to be clear also that many of the ideas generated within the Paracollege have had some impact upon the institution as a

whole. Yet as the Paracollege now becomes an established unit, how will other innovations be attempted? The question for Saint Olaf becomes that of whether additional units should be established or whether something less than a college-within-a-college can be employed as an experimental unit.

The third type of response to need for change has been that of the introduction of less extensive changes within the instructional program. Sometimes described pejoratively as "piecemeal" changes, these are nonetheless the most frequently introduced changes and the kind most likely to be sustained. While not always introduced for any logical or consistent reason, they nonetheless, because they do not threaten the whole structure, are likely to be more readily accepted and maintained. Change in general education programs is a case in point.

In recent years there has been considerable discussion within undergraduate institutions of the place of general education. While general education as such was most actively discussed and developed during the 1940s, it still remains under a variety of designations as one of the basic concerns of these institutions. What shall be the proper balance of specialized and general study? What shall be the appropriate balance between individualized and common programs? How much work should be given to assisting the student to develop more general capacities and skills?

The monograph on instructional programs discusses the variety of approaches currently underway.[104] It is difficult to generalize, except to suggest that the issue of general education is still very much alive. If there is any perceptible trend it seems to be one of moving away from a great number of prescribed courses to distribution requirements and to move from distribution requirements to individually designed or contracted sequences. While there continue to be instances of the development of new integrated and new freshman and lower division sequences, the prevailing mood seems to be that of allowing

the student "to do his own thing" and to build his own program--albeit with some guidance within broad areas resembling those associated with distribution requirements. The total program earlier developed by the University of Chicago and those programs recommended for Harvard and Columbia seem to be less the norm and more the exception. The apparent emphasis of the contemporary students on the practical and the applied seems also to be causing institutions to develop more career-oriented courses and various types of certificate programs of less than baccalaureate level. According to one recent article, students are "reportedly abandoning theoretical, abstract, and purely academic fields for those that relate directly to jobs." Enrollments are down in English and history and the foreign languages, and some faculties are turning to "applied humanities," i.e. to the application of the skills of people in the humanities to interdisciplinary problems wherein team consisting of persons from the humanities and the applied field attempt to deal with issues from a more broadly humanist viewpoint.[105]

In spite of what seems to be the prevailing trend, there is some evidence that a number of colleges have attempted to introduce new types of interdisciplinary sequences dealing with broad issues of human resources, community service and public affairs. In addition to these interdepartmental and interdisciplinary concentrations, a number of new types of studies have emerged such as the following: ethnic studies, Black studies, environmental studies, non-Western studies, women's studies, futuristics, computer science, policy science, arms control and foreign policy, peace studies, the management of change, forensic science, drug and alcohol addiction, ethics in medicine. Almost two-thirds of the colleges and universities in the country have introduced some form of ethnic studies. Black studies as such are found in over 400 institutions. Urban and environmental studies are apparently growing rapidly, and more than 100 colleges and universities offer courses in the field of futuristics, courses concerned with planning and forecasting.

Just what long-range impact these new studies will have remains yet to be seen. Various types of "new" sequences have been introduced in American colleges and universities since the beginning of the 19th century. Some have survived, and others have disappeared, only to be revived at later dates. The fieldsof sociology and psychology are essentially creations of the late 19th century. Even American literature and American history were "new" studies of the late 19th century. Undoubtedly some of the new sequences will find established places within the college curriculum, while others will disappear or be absorbed into more established departmental sequences. But it seems important to allow for the emergence and testing of new disciplines. This is the way in which the curriculum renews itself. And most, if not all of the Lutheran colleges, have been engaged in some such form of experimentation.

Perhaps the most extensive changes have been in the development of new calendars. Over the years there has continued to be some shifting between quarter and semester calendars, with the semester structures remaining the prevailing pattern. But in the early 1960s, with the introduction, or perhaps the reintroduction, of the intersession, a variety of new types of college calendars emerged, the most popular which has been the four-one-four format (two terms of semester length, during which students enroll in four courses or some variation thereof, and an intersession of approximately one month during which the students concentrate upon a single course). Other variations include the three-three structure, in which students enroll for three courses during each of three quarter-length terms of ten to twelve weeks; the modular course plan, during which students enroll in one course in three or four week blocks; and varied semester-length calendar programs.

Over 500 colleges and universities have introduced some variation of the four-one-four calendar. While Bennington and Sarah Lawrence colleges had incorporated an interim and off-campus unit in their calendars in the 1920s,

the great interest in the four-one-four developed in the early sixties with the efforts of Florida Presbyterian College, now Eckerd College. The report for 1970-71 indicates that the majority of the Lutheran colleges maintain a semester calendar, with the four-one-four being the next most frequently employed. Only one college at that time was using the three-three calendar. Other variations among the Lutheran colleges included the quarter system, the three-one-three-three, the one-four-four and the four-four-one.[106]

Other curricular variations found among colleges and universities in the mid-1970s include the introduction of some form of a pass-fail system. While initially the emphasis was upon broadening opportunities for pass-fail, there seems in recent years to be a move toward restricting the use of the pass-fail option, although there are few institutions that do not have some form of the pass-fail option.

Advising programs have been revised and revamped, but no institution has yet come up with the ideal program.

If any lesson emerges from a review of the incredible variety of curricular programs underway, it is that at this particular point in history one may find almost any variation in the teaching-learning process in one institution or another. There is no single pattern at the undergraduate level for sequence or requirements, although most institutions combine some element of concentration and "general" or "liberal" education. No one type of academic calendar is uniformly found. There is a wide variation in grading practices, although the majority of the institutions retain the traditional letter grades while providing greater or fewer pass-fail options, or variations thereof. There appears to be a heavy component of "experiential" or off-campus work, although the majority of the institutions still operate within the conventional on-campus classroom format. In one sense there is probably less uniformity in the undergraduate degree sequence than ever before. In another sense, most of

the new and experimental programs are simply variations of patterns that have been attempted before.

There is precious little in the experiments that is new. We seem to have learned little from past experience, and we are, as institutions, insistent upon making our own mistakes and trying out our own programs. Perhaps this is the best way to go; institutions do differ in terms of types of students enrolled and emphases of faculty. Yet, with all of the concern for innovation and experimentation, it becomes abundantly clear that any institution that is radically different from its sister institutions has a difficult time. With considerable mobility among the students, there is still great concern for transferability and interchangibility of courses and credits. Any new program has to be prepared to translate its work into more conventional terms, and if elements are too "far out," students have difficulty in applying the courses in other institutions.

We find at the same time a pressure for change and variation and a counterpressure for conformity and uniformity. It seems to be a matter of each institution working out its own destiny. While there may be very little evidence that variations in programming have profound and long-range impacts upon students, the study of long-range impacts has been fairly limited. We would urge that the Lutheran colleges respond to the current interest in innovation, but we see the most promising paths to be taken are those of introducing alternate programs through variations of the college-within-a-college, the use of interim or intersession periods within the several variations of the four-one-four as the way to maintain a certain degree of stability and at the same time provide opportunity for experimentation. And, whether or not a particular experiment dramatically changes the learning outcomes, in spite of many of the disclaimers to the contrary, it may indeed be that change for the sake of change is worthwhile. In a period of steady

or declining enrollment, experimentation is still an appropriate concern. We would hope that as experimentation is undertaken, more careful effort be given to examining the consequences of changes.

V. Financing the Program

The release in the early months of 1970 of Earl Cheit's report on the financial conditions of 41 colleges and universities, in which it was estimated that over 60 percent of the colleges and universities in the United States were headed for financial trouble or were already in financial difficulty, seemed to confirm what a number of other observers had already noted. The title of Cheit's book, The New Depression in Higher Education, became a new password. Just emerging from a half decade of disruption that had culminated in Kent State in May, 1970, higher educational institutions seemed to be moving from one kind of crisis into another.

Various writers have tried to pinpoint the beginning of the crisis and the end of the "golden age" in American higher education. Virginia Smith has referred to the decade between 1957 and 1967 as the golden decade, at least in fiscal matters. Expenditures rose from 5 billion to over 15 billion and enrollment rose from 2.5 million to over 5.5 million.[107] But already, by 1967 there was evidence that all was not well with the enterprise. Instructional costs had increased, and were during the late 1960s averaging more than eight percent per year for certain private universities.[108] And even while state appropriations were climbing, tax-supported institutions were also experiencing difficulties. In a report to the Association of American Colleges in early 1971, William W. Jellema, reported that "most colleges in the red are staying in the red and many are getting redder, while colleges in the black are generally growing grayer."[109]

In response to the tightening financial situation, colleges began cutting budgets and effecting economies wherever possible. Some hoped for new aid from federal and state governments, but were disappointed. Later in 1971 it was reported that private gifts to U.S. colleges and universities showed a dollar decrease for the first time in more than a decade.[110]

Early in 1972 it appeared that a turnaround was occurring, as it was reported that private gifts and grants had again begun to increase and had for 1970-71 now reached a record high.[111] However, the major sources of the increase was alumni and "non-alumni individuals." A number of institutions also reported that by budget cutting and more efficient use of resources they were moving out of the red into the black. Some attributed the changed conditions to more effective management procedures.

In April, 1973, Earl Cheit's second report found that by increasing their use of cost-control measures, the majority of the 41 institutions he had earlier studied had managed to escape or avoid serious financial trouble in the intervening period. As a matter of fact, 26 of the 41 institutions reported that their current financial situation was the same or better than it had been two years earlier.[112] With the beginning of the academic year 1973-74, optimism seemed to be increasing, and it was reported that "a cautious optimism and cautious pessimism" characterized "the financial mood of the nation's colleges and universities as academic 1973-74 gets underway."[113] But as the year wore on, it was clear that the situation was far from settled. A study by the University of Michigan's Center for the Study of Higher Education suggested that inflation was probably obscuring the true condition of financially troubled colleges. The Center found that while expenditures per student had gone up somewhat in the decade reviewed, when inflation was taken into account, in the last few years there had been an actual decline in the expenditure per student.[114] The President of Georgetown University was warning that Phase II of the financial crunch for private higher education was just around the corner.[115]

The situation for 1974-75 is mixed. For some private colleges, a combination of increased tuition and wide-ranging economies seems to have restored a measure of fiscal stability to the enterprise. Others are still accumulating debts at a frightening rate, and the sound of closing doors haunts those who have survived. Some observers are convinced that the combination of increased tuition and cost-cutting budgeting has reached something of a logical limit; there are few places left to cut without impairing quality, and tuition may have been increased to the upper limits. Others are convinced that neither is the case, and that there are in addition other untapped resources. Early in 1971 Alice M. Rivlin, a Senior Fellow at Brookings Institution and former Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, suggested that there was no general crisis in higher education in finance, but "rather, there are several sets of factors affecting various kinds of institutions in various ways at the same time, some permanent and some temporary."[116]

There are probably three basic ways in which the financial crisis can be met: (1) increase income, or (2) decrease expenditures, or (3) work with a combination of both. With regard to sources of income, higher educational institutions in 1971-72, the last year for which we have fairly definitive data, received for current operations approximately 30 billion dollars.[117] Approximately a third of this income was derived from tuition and fees, although nearly 43 percent of the fee income may have been derived indirectly or directly from various types of federal, state and private student support. If that portion of the student fees derived from governmental and other sources is subtracted from the total tuition paid, then the distribution of income for higher educational institutions is roughly 20 percent from tuition and fees, approximately 31 percent from state and local government sources, just over 27 percent from federal sources, approximately 9 percent from private

philanthropy and nearly 12 percent from auxiliary enterprises and other activities. This is the overall distribution, and there are obvious variations between public and private institutions. Private institutions depend relatively more upon tuition and public institutions depend relatively more upon state and local sources.

Subtracting the income from auxiliary enterprises and dealing only with Educational and General income (the income derived from current operations, exclusive of income from residence halls, food services, and the like) it appears that with some minor variations in the 1940s, tuition and fees have over the years constituted approximately 25 percent of the income. There is some evidence that tuition and fees are providing in the last few years somewhat larger proportions of the income. Governmental sources, federal as well as state and local, are approaching 60 percent of the income, with some increases in state and local support and decreases in federal support during the last few years. Private gifts and grants have leveled off at approximately six to seven percent of Educational and General, plus those funds which are indirectly provided through scholarship and other student aid. Endowment has come to play a smaller and smaller part of the total financing, constituting hardly three percent of the Educational and General income in recent years.

Few matters have been as roundly debated in current literature as those relating to tuition charges. It is not difficult to understand why this is the case, because one's position with regard to tuition can reflect in many ways basic attitudes toward higher education. While the immediate reaction to proposals either to increase or to decrease tuition may be based on costs and the need for more or less revenue, the question of whether tuition should constitute a larger or smaller proportion of costs is essentially, to use the title of the Carnegie report, "Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay?"[118]

As a nation we have accepted the principle that common schooling should extend through the secondary level. While attending such schools is not totally without cost, by public policy we are committed to providing an essentially free and tax-supported system of schools through the elementary and secondary levels. Such has not been the case in higher education. Or, at least, there is no uniformity of opinion regarding the extent to which access to higher education should reflect the same principle of access as that found in secondary education. In many of the debates the issue has become one of assigning benefits. We seem generally to be convinced that free schooling through the secondary level is important because society as a whole benefits from having an educated citizenry. When it comes to post-secondary education, however, there are many who argue that it is the individual who primarily benefits and, to the extent to which postsecondary education provides essentially individual benefits, to that extent the individual should be required to pay.

But the position that postsecondary education primarily benefits the individual is not universally accepted. There are those who argue that society is primarily the benefactor and that society should bear the greatest portion of expenses. The issue becomes, at the risk of oversimplification, that there are some who emphasize education as a consumption, for the immediate benefit accruing to those who participate in it, while others view it as an investment, with the benefits accruing to a larger portion of society over a longer period of time. These differing points of view have been present for a long time, but they are presently being expressed more sharply in this time of social stress and financial pressure.

National reports such as those of the Carnegie Commission and the Committee for Economic Development have argued for increasing tuition rates in public institutions to a level more like that of private institutions and to offset

these increases for those who need the assistance with substantial federal and state subsidized assistance programs. The monograph on financing goes into some detail regarding the various proposals that have been made, and we shall not attempt to recapitulate the arguments here.[119] We would only observe that in the meantime tuition and fees have continued to increase for both public and private institutions. Overall costs for attending college have risen 40 percent in four years, between 1970-71 and 1974-75. And between 1974-75 and 1975-76 costs will average 12 percent higher in public and 8 percent higher in private colleges.[120] Working against the general increase in tuition has been the attempt on the part of some units of the University of Wisconsin to decrease tuition. At the time of this writing, the move on the part of the entire system to reduce tuition has met some opposition in the state legislature.[121]

For private institutions increasing tuition without providing for additional student aid funds is likely to restrict an already tightening "market." One of the first reports of the Carnegie Commission demonstrated quite clearly that the net return from tuition increases is likely to be less than anticipated. William G. Bowen's study of the income-expenditure pattern in major private universities was issued in 1968. In that study he singled out for special analysis three institutions, Chicago, Princeton and Vanderbilt. He noted that between 1958 and 1966 tuition had increased at an average rate of slightly over 8 percent per year in these institutions. He deducted expenditures on student aid from the gross fee and calculated an index of the net fee income per student which could be compared with the index of gross fee income per student. During the period of time under study he found a widening gap between the gross fee income per student and the net fee income per student. Indeed, when he compared changes over a shorter period of time, between 1962 and 1966, he found that while gross fee income per student had

increased more than $400, the net fee income per student had increased less than $90.[122]

The first lesson that we ought to have learned from our dependence upon student fees for current operating income is that while it apparently is necessary to offset some of the tuition increase with a provision of added student aid funds, unless we examine very carefully the net effect, the balance of gross and net tuition increase, we may find that increases in tuition actually have very little overall positive effect upon the operating income of the institution. To the extent to which a private institution must depend upon its own resources for building student aid, to that extent the balance between expected increases in income and the anticipated need in student funds must be carefully examined. There is little direct advice that can be given, since the circumstances for each institution differ considerably. But it can be said that simply increasing tuition does not automatically add to the net funds available for current operations. In testing its own clientele, a college needs to take into account the increase in tuition, discounted by a factor to acknowledge inflation, further discounted by funds anticipated to be needed to assist those students who now will need some or additional student aid. Then, examining what the net actual increase in current operations may be, an institution is in a much better position to determine whether the tuition increase is sufficient or whether the tuition increase proposed is actually worth the effort.

Compounding the problem for private institutions is the new set of standards by which the College Scholarship Service makes its estimates of how much money parents should be expected to contribute to the cost of their children's education. The new schedule, to go into effect for 1975-76, shows a sharply reduced figure in all of the categories. The reduction was made in September, 1974, because of projected 18 percent increase in the Consumer

Price Index between February, 1973 and December, 1974. The College Scholarship Service, in calculating parental contributions, deducts items such as taxes, medical expenses, retirement allowances, and other special costs from a family's total income to calculate an "adjusted income." It is on the basis of the adjusted income that CSS indicates expected contributions. For example, a family with an adjusted income of $8,000 was expected to contribute $900 for one child in college in 1974-75. This is reduced to $290 in 1975-76. At the upper levels of income, a family with an adjusted income of $20,000 was expected to contribute $6,270 to the support of one child in college in 1974-75; in 1975-76 this was reduced to $4,910. These adjustments have the effect of making students eligible for more financial aid from outside sources. The only problem is that comparable increases in available funds from outside sources are not in sight.[123]

The problem for the private institution is that students will now be, according to CSS recommendations, eligible for more financial support. If, however, the additional financial support is only to be derived from internal funds, then very substantial increases in tuition will be required in order to build up the internal funds. But, the increased tuition may serve as a depressant, and it may reduce the number of students applying for admission. Unfortunately, there is no clear standard by which to determine what the cutoff points may be. It seems to us very important, however, for individual institutions to assess more clearly the ability to pay of the clientele attracted and that they enter into these rounds of tuition increases with clearer understanding of the implications.

One factor that will possibly assist private institutions in living with the necessity of increasing tuition is the availability of federal grants and federally subsidized loans as well as state assistance. Federally insured low-interest student loans, however, have experienced significant defaults. The

President's budget message in early 1974 announced as a major goal an expansion of guaranteed loan programs, and in the request presented in January, 1975, there was a $31,000,000 increase over the previous year's budget increase. However, of the $31,000,000 increase, some $26,000,000 was directed to cover defaults, while only $5,000,000 would cover interest subsidies which the government pays for needy students. Moreover, in the request for $30,800,000 supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1974, it was noted that all of this money would be needed to pay increased 1973 and 1974 defaults.[124] A report in the fall of 1974 indicated that the Federal Government may be facing a loss of over half a billion dollars in defaults.[125]

Faced with the serious defaults, the U.S. Office of Education has proposed new criteria for removing colleges and universities from guaranteed student loan programs. Yet, in spite of the many problems in the proposed new regulations, it appeared that as academic year 1974-75 got underway, government-insured loans were apparently more available than during the previous year. The dollar amount had not, however, reached the peak lending rate of the 1971-72 academic year. For many students, the situation was still tight. It was noted that "for freshmen, as for other new borrowers, for poorer students, for city dwellers, for students at high-priced institutions, at graduate schools, and at community colleges, much of the picture is still gloomy."[126]

The direct loan program, the National Direct Student Loan Program, established in 1959 as the National Defense Student Loan Program, was also facing serious difficulties. Under this program, institutions could make loans directly to students rather than requiring students to seek loans on their own from banks as is the case for guaranteed loans. It now appears that defaults are also high in the direct loan program, and an increasing number of institutions are turning to outside collection agencies to replace

the funds made available through the federal program. For fiscal 1975 it was estimated that approximately $321,000,000 would have been used in direct loans. For fiscal 1976 no funds were requested under the direct loan program.[127] Already, in late October 1974, the College Entrance Examination Board had estimated that student financial aid funds for higher education from federal, state, and private sources would have to be increased by an estimated two billion dollars for 1975-76, but that it was unlikely that such funds would be made available. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., President of CEEB, predicted there would be a two billion dollar aid gap for 1975-76.[128] The fiscal 1976 budget shows a clear shift in emphasis from direct loans to insured loans, basic opportunity grants, where over one billion dollars was requested.[129]

While private institutions have attempted to develop their own loan programs, such as the contingency loan program, under which students would repay tuition loans over a 25 to 30 year period, the majority of private institutions will have to depend upon a combination of federal assistance, their own immediate sources, and state assistance.

The pressure on state governments for the support of the state systems of education has increased dramatically in recent years. But even as state governments have experienced the increased demands from tax-supported institutions, they have in a rather remarkable way moved to provide assistance, often indirect, to private institutions. The main form of assistance has been through state scholarships and grant funds. By late 1974 there were student-assistance programs in 41 states and trust territories. While a number of state constitutions bar the use of public funds for private institutions, the majority of the state courts have not interpreted the provisions so narrowly and have held to the general principle that when state funds are used for "public purposes" the question is less a matter of who handles the money than the purpose for which it is used.[130]

The Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education notes that in 1972 some 19 states provided direct aid to private colleges. Much of the state aid to private institutions is, however, indirect, and the primary method is through state scholarship and grant programs. While there were some forms of aid programs in over 40 of the states, only 35 were providing some form of aid, either direct or indirect, to private colleges and universities. Minnesota and Oregon adopted in 1971 a provision whereby the state could "contract" with private colleges for the education of state residents. That same year, in Illinois, Maryland and Washington adopted programs of direct grants to private institutions.[131]

As we have noted, a total of 35 states provided aid in 1971, directly or indirectly to private colleges and universities. Some of the programs had not been funded, but by February, 1972, at least 22 of these states were operating state-funded scholarship programs and providing in 1971-72 a total of 279.4 million dollars to private institutions. Only eight states had provided scholarship programs as recently as a decade before.[132] The number of states and the number of dollars expended had increased by late 1974. In most instances, scholarship funds could be used at both public and private institutions. It is estimated that approximately 60 percent of all of the state monies made available through scholarship programs have gone to students in private colleges and universities.[133]

The Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education expressed the opinion that continued growth in student aid programs is likely to occur, especially "in the form of non-competitive grants for students attending public and private institutions."[134] The Commission also reported an interest in many states to increase aid to private institutions, both because representatives of private colleges and universities had become more effective in presenting their causes and because many private institutions have unused instructional capacity.

We would observe, however, that in states where both public and private institutions have stopped growing in enrollment, the friction between public and private institutions has begun to increase significantly. There have already been several court tests of state aid to private institutions. These cases are discussed in the monograph on finance.[135] While in large part the issue has been decided in favor of continued assistance to private nonsectarian institutions, we would guess that the issue is far from closed. There will be additional court tests in the future.

It also seems likely that there will be continued increases in state assistance to private institutions. It must be pointed out, however, that private institutions should be prepared to recognize that the more public funds they receive, the more they will be held accountable to public authorities. As one writer observes, "private institutions must be prepared to consider methods of accountability along with methods of public funding."[136] And another writer suggests that private institutions will be tempted to adjust their programs on the basis of state aid and may find themselves in awkward positions if the aid declines. In addition, state aid may be tied to state-residence status and this may force colleges to concentrate more on in-state students rather than a more national student representation.[137]

Current federal policy seems to be to emphasize student aid as the major source of federal support for education, and the distribution of expenditures for fiscal 1974 under the Office of Education were overwhelmingly in the area of student assistance. Within Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Institutes of Health provide substantial funds for higher education, but these are for specialized projects as are the funds granted through the National Science Foundation. During 1974 several attempts were made to introduce legislation providing direct assistance to higher education, but none were successful. The latest was the attempt in August of two members of the

Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator Robert C. Byrd and Senator Warren G. Magnuson to add $50,000,000 to the appropriation bill for H.E.W., but the recommendation died in the Committee. Reviewing federal involvement in higher education over the last decade, Howard Bowen notices a direct shift from general institutional aid to establishing as the major goal for new federal programs the encouragement of needy and low-middle-income students to attend college. The principle was clearly expressed in the Higher Education Amendments of 1972.[138]

Many different proposals continue to emerge, but the basic orientation at this point in time in federal funding of higher educational institutions seems to lie in finding the most effective way of providing student aid. Representative James G. O'Hara of Michigan, who took over the House of Representative's Higher Education Subcommittee in 1973, has emerged as one of the leading spokesmen for maintaining low tuition and providing student aid. In his address to the American Council on Education in October, 1974, O'Hara said that he would "seek to construct a student aid system that recognizes that low tuition has done more for improved popular access to postsecondary education than all the student aid programs put together. I will certainly give no aid and comfort to a system which tacitly encourages the raising of tuitions as a means of maximizing an institution's piece of the federal pie."[139]

Gifts and grants from private sources constituted approximately six percent of the Educational and General income in the early 1970s. While the dollar amount from such sources continues apparently to increase, the proportion has remained more or less stable at between six and seven percent. For some private institutions these sources have constituted and continue to constitute a greater proportion of income. Business firms still remain a major source of gifts and grants from private sources. Foundations, earlier expected to increase their proportion of giving, by the fall of 1974 appeared less likely

sources than before. It was not only a matter of assets being down, because the earnings of the foundations had remained fairly stable, but many foundations during the years of rising stock market prices had taken some of their capital gains for grants, and they found themselves in a position of needing to sell stocks to raise the same amount of money to cover their grants, and this further reduced shrinking assets.[140] While there have been objections of some businessmen to giving unrestricted grants to private colleges and universities, by and large the business segment has seen such grants as a public service.[141]

Some institutions have turned to other sources of income. A number of smaller colleges offering predominately liberal arts programs have branched out into career education.[142] And some institutions have entered into revenue-generating activities.[143]

As we have already observed, the apparent turnaround in financing of higher education observed by Cheit and others appeared to be less a matter of securing vastly increased sources of income and more a matter of reducing expenditures. Howard Bowen's assessment of the current state of the debate over financing higher education, to which we have already referred, observed that during 1973 one of the top concerns was that the efficiency of higher education should be improved. It is worthy of note, however, that in his summary of the current state of the art, eight of the items were related to increasing income and only one to improving efficiency.[144]

There are some who have suggested that maximum economies have already been achieved and that very little in the way of reduced expenditures can further be accomplished. The President of Georgetown University, in May, 1974, speaking to the Association for Institutional Research, contended that another financial crunch for private education was on the way, because in the first phase of the financial crisis most institutions had already put their

institutional budgets through the wringer, and there simply was little more in the way of economy that could be achieved.

The situation probably lies at some point between, namely that economies are still possible, but there are also limits to the economies that can be effected. There has been a persistent increase in the unit cost, the cost per student, over the years. Whether it is possible to decrease the rate at which this particular item has increased is an open question. Some economists have argued that the increase in unit cost is endemic to the educational process. Whereas in industry the output per worker has gone up, in education, the output, if anything, has decreased. The output per worker in labor during the course of the twentieth century has increased in most industries at a remarkably steady rate, while in higher educational institutions productivity has actually decreased. Higher educational institutions have benefitted from some of the technological innovations, but the trend has been toward lowering teaching loads, enriching programs, and multiplying activities. Education participates in the general category of industry in which increases in productivity come more slowly, if at all, than in the economy as a whole and in which the cost per unit may be expected to increase more than costs in general.

At least, the position outlined above has been the line of reasoning in the past. Such reasoning is currently being challenged, and the Carnegie Commission, among others, has not only called for more efficiency but has argued that more efficiency is possible. The Commission's proposals have been of two major kinds: (1) reduce the total number of years of the student in training and (2) reduce the cost per student hour. Our own feeling is that it is highly questionable whether reducing the length of student training benefits anyone except the student himself. The institution will continue to maintain the staff and range of programs necessary to provide for the student, irregardless

of how long it takes the student to complete the program. There may be some possibilities for decreasing cost per student credit hour. The Carnegie Commission contends that cost per student credit hour can be decreased by ten percent and suggests the following sources of saving: making more effective use of resources in relation to students in attendance by halting the creation of new Ph.D. programs, achieving minimum effective size for campuses now below that size, moving toward year-round operation, cautiously raising the student-faculty ratio, reexamining the faculty teaching load, improving management by better selection and training of middle management, creating more alternative programs off-campus, and establishing consortia among institutions.[145] The Commission also argues against what it considers unwise, though tempting short-run economies such as reducing necessary maintenance, reducing library expenditures for new books and journals, and failing to increase student aid as tuition and fees increase. The Commission also asks for improving the budget-making process by more effective analysis and programming.

This plea for more effective planning is found in a score of recent reports. James Harvey summarizes a number of the reports in institutional planning available as of March, 1971.[146] The Ohio Board of Regents under its management improvement program during 1971-73 developed a very detailed planning manual. Planning is emphasized heavily in the report of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education. One of the concluding chapters of that report is directed toward developing better procedures for institutional costing and data reporting.[147] Howard Bowen and Gordon Douglass have provided a detailed analysis of cost and outputs of instruction at hypothetical small liberal arts colleges.[148] Charles Benson and Harold Hodgkinson have also provided an analysis of how efficiency in colleges and universities can be enhanced.[149]

One gains the impression that techniques are abundantly available for more efficient use of resources and space. What is lacking is any clear evidence that educational quality is influenced in one way or another by changes in methodology and approach. Perhaps it is impossible to secure such evidence, and perhaps the debates will ever continue regarding how much "efficiency" can be effected without reducing educational "quality."

Earl Cheit's second look at the new depression in higher education contains summaries of reports from the 41 institutions included in the original study. Twenty-three of the schools were private institutions. He observed that with the growing awareness of the cost-income squeeze, institutions began to develop new managerial practices and organizational relationships. The short-term consequence of this development was a sharp reduction in the rate of growth of the institutions' expenditures. But Cheit suggests that this development led to a more long-term consequence:

> Questions of money eventually lead to questions of purpose, and these new management practices and organizational relationships form the evolving system by which schools are making the transition from money questions to purpose questions. The additional consequence of these new practices and relationships, therefore, is the development of new administrative and standards of judgment about educational quality and purpose.[150]

He observed that although the new financial stability is fragile and may prove to be short run, it nevertheless is a significant achievement. He found that during the intervening two years between the original study and the review, virtually all of the institutions there had come about an increased campus-wide awareness of rising costs and their implications. All but five of the institutions reported that faculty, students and staff members had become more aware of costs. Faculty and staff had become more alert to the realities of the cash flow within the organization. And while there was some reduction in expectation regarding future developments, even

some concern that innovation might be restricted, there was also developing a climate open to future change. There was also more of an acceptance of the idea of a "managed institution."[151]

Some 30 of the 41 institutions had begun to develop overall strategies for better management. More attention was being given to the reduction of costs; indeed Cheit found that "the reduction of expenditure growth is now as central, or more central, to administrative outlook than increasing income."[152] With regard to cost-cutting, it was found that appeals for voluntary efforts by operating units were not particularly effective, that administrative decision was needed. In the process of cutting cost, however, it was found that administration cannot appear to act arbitrarily, that across-the-board cuts were generally ineffective and that better approaches were deferring, freezing, cutting, pooling various activities, better purchasing, more efficient scheduling, and improved food handling and dormitorys.

He also found some change in the role of the administration. He suggests that in the recent past a new program was the product of faculty initiative for the most part, but that as administrators have taken on more of the managerial role, their task has been to provide in advance the conditions that make operations and new programs possible. The administrator is now becoming a key element in deciding whether, when, and on what terms change is possible.[153] This also leads to concern on the part of the faculty of their role, and Cheit observed the establishment in many institutions of faculty-staff committees designed to assure participation in planning and budgeting.

We conclude by observing that there are a host of manuals suggesting new approaches to budgeting and management. Most of these documents will not be very helpful to institutions if these institutions attempt to apply them directly. As much as anything, as we see it, there is need for a climate

that accepts an institution as a managed enterprise, that provides the machinery whereby those affected can participate in some of the critical decisions relating to expenditures, and that the development of a series of three to five year projections becomes critical in maintaining a spirit of management.

Notes

[1]The general title for the five monographs is: Trends in American Higher Education (A Review of Recent Literature). The individual titles in the sequence are:

No. 1 Enrollments (35 pages and notes)
No. 2 Students in the 70's (41 pages and notes)
No. 3 Governance--Organization and Administration (81 pages and notes)
No. 4 Instructional Programs (83 pages and notes)
No. 5 Financing the Program (95 pages and notes)

These monographs encompass some 335 pages of text, to which have been added extensive notes for reference.

[2]Resources for the Future. Papers and Proceedings of the 57th Annual Convention, Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. (Washington, D.C.: LECNA, 1971). Also available was the updated report, Toward a Master Plan, 1971 Supplement to the 1970 Study of Lutheran Colleges and Universities, 1972.

[3]Carol H. Shulman, Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects. ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 9 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974), p. 1.

[4]Cf. U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1966 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 63. Also, note later editions, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1967, p. 66, and Digest of Educational Statistics, 1971, p. 66.

[5]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Capitol and the Campus (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 65.

[6]National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 86.

[7]Carol H. Shulman, Private Colleges, op. cit., p. 2.

[8]Fred M. Hechinger, "Is Common Action Possible?" Change, 4 (September, 1972), pp. 41-42.

[9]"How Shall Private Higher Education Be Saved? Or Should It Be?" Change, 7 (February, 1975), pp. 46-48.

[10]Cf. Morris T. Keeton, Models and Mavericks (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971) and C. Robert Pace, Education and Evangelism (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972).

[11]Morris T. Keeton, Models and Mavericks, op. cit., p. 29.

[12]Ibid., p. 30.

[13]C. Robert Pace, The Demise of Diversity? (New York. McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974), pp. 129, 130.

[14]C. Robert Pace, Education and Evangelism, op. cit., pp. 104-105.

[15]"Private Colleges That Have Closed, Merged, or 'Gone Public' in the '70's," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (August 5, 1974), p. 5.

[16]Carol H. Shulman, Private Colleges, op. cit., p. 1.

[17]Allan O. Pfnister, "Developing Relationships between Public and Private Higher Education," New Directions in Statewide Higher Education Planning and Coordination. Proceedings of the 19th SREB Legislative Work Conference (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1970), pp. 38 ff.

[18]"Independent, Not Private, Silber Tells Church-Related College Administrators," Higher Education and Ministry. Report of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, The United Methodist Church. (February - March, 1975), p. 1.

[19]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 3-4.

[20]"Those Missing Babies," Time, 104 (September 16, 1974), p. 55.

[21]Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education (A Review of Recent Literature), No. 1 Enrollments, pp. 2-3.

[22]Cf. Lyman A. Glenny, "The Illusions of Steady State," Change, 10 (December - January 1974-75), pp. 24-28. and Larry L. Leslie and Howard F. Miller, Jr., Higher Education and the Steady State. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 4, 1974 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974).

[23]Larry L. Leslie and Howard F. Miller, Jr., Higher Education and the Steady State, op. cit., p. 8.

[24]U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 73.

[25]Cf. "25- to 34-Year-Old Students On Increase in Nation's Colleges," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (December 2, 1974), p. 6.

[26]Cf. Resources for the Future, op. cit., and Toward a Master Plan, op. cit.

[27]Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education, Enrollments, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

[28]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Priorities for Action, op. cit., pp. 127, 128.

[29]Ibid., p. 100.

[30]U.S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Social and Economic Characteristics of Students, October, 1972, Current Population Reports: Population Characteristics, Series P-20, no. 260, February, 1974 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974), p. 3.

[31]Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education, Enrollments, op. cit., pp. 18-21.

[32]Malcolm G. Scully, "Fewer Score High on the College Boards," Chronicle of Higher Education, X (March 3, 1975). pp. 1, 7.

[33]Ibid.

[34]"College Enrollments Down, Seminaries Hold," The Lutheran, 13 (March 5, 1975), p. 24. Cf. also "The Admissions Outlook for Fall," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (February 10, 1975), pp. 1, 2.

[35]Resources for the Future, op. cit., p. 38.

[36]Toward a Master Plan, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

[37]Quoted in, Malcolm G. Scully, "Higher Education's Expansion Outlook Held Almost Unlimited," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (May 13, 1974), p. 4.

[38]Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education, Enrollments, op. cit., pp. 23 ff.

[39]F. Patricia Cross, Beyond the Open Door (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), pp. 8, 9, 10.

[40]Ibid., p. 25.

[41]Robert L. Jacobson, "Colleges are not Meeting Needs of Adults, Panel on Non-Traditional Study Finds," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (February 5, 1973), p. 7.

[42]Abraham Carp, Richard Peterson and Pamela Rolfs, "Adult Learning Interests and Experiences," Planning Non-Traditional Programs, edited by K. Patricia Cross, et al. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974), pp. 11-52.

[43]Jack Magarrell, "Part-Timers: Students Massively Discriminated Against," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (July 8, 1974), p. 12.

[44]Dyckman W. Vermilye (editor) Lifelong Learners--A New Clientele for Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974), p. ix.

[45]Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education (A Review of Recent Literature, No. 2 Students in the 70's.

[46]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Dissent and Disruption: Proposals for Consideration by the Campus (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971) p. 103.

[47]Jack Magarrell, "'Startling Shifts' Found in Youths' Views of Work, Morals," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (May 28, 1974), p. 3 Quotes from study by Daniel Yankelovich.

[48]Robert E. Karsten, "A Classification of Interpretation of the Causes and Meanings of Campus Disturbance," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1972), p. 436.

[49]Quoted in Calvin Lee, The Campus Scene, 1900-1970: Changing Styles in Undergraduate Life (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970), p. 108.

[50]The President's Commission on Campus Unrest, Campus Unrest (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 185.

[51]"A Report Card on All Those Campus Reforms of the 60s," U.S. News and World Report, 76 (May 6, 1974), pp. 29-40.

[52]Nevitt Sanford, "The College Student in the World Today," The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis, edited by Kaoru Yamamoto (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 131.

[53]Philip W. Semas, "Students 'Satisfied' with Education, Most of Them and Teachers Agree," Chronicle of Higher Education, V (January 18, 1971), p. 1.

[54]John Magarrell, "'Startling Shifts' Found in Youths' View of Work, Morals," op. cit., p. 3.

[55]Kenneth Keniston, "Social Change and Youth in America," Daedalus, 91 (Winter, 1962), pp. 155-160.

[56]Jack Magarrell, "Black Enrollment Rising Again: One-Year Decline Has Been Reversed, Census Bureau Sampling Indicates," Chronicle of Higher Education, X (March 17, 1975), pp. 1, 3.

[57]Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education (A Review of Recent Literature), No. 2 Students in the 70's, pp. 33 ff.

[58]James R. Goss, "Learning in an Open Society: A European Viewpoint," paper presented at 29th National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 12, 1974.

[59]James O'Toole, "Education, Work and the Quality of Life," paper presented at 29th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, March 11, 1974.

[60]Alexander M. Mood, The Future of Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 65.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education (A Review of Recent Literature), No. 3 Governance (Organization and Administration), p. 1.

[63]President's Commission on Campus Unrest, Campus Unrest, op. cit, p. 202.

[64]Ibid., pp. 1-2.

[65]Ibid., p. 3.

[66]Earl J. McGrath, Should Students Share the Power? (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970), p. 103.

[67]Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education, Governance (Organization and Administration), op. cit., pp. 15-16.

[68]Ibid., pp. 21 ff.

[69]Cf. Bardwell L. Smith, "New Governance, Old Problems," Liberal Education, 58 (December, 1972), pp. 478-487.

[70]Ibid., p. 485.

[71]Burton Clark, "Faculty Organization and Authority," Academic Governance, edited by J. Victor Baldridge (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1971), p. 236.

[72]T.R. McConnell, "Faculty Governance," Power and Authority, edited by Harold L. Hodgkinson and L. Richard Meeth (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971), p. 100.

[73]Leon D. Epstein, Governing the University (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1974), pp. 143-144.

[74]Phillip W. Semas, "Putting Faculty Unions Between Covers," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (October 7, 1974), p. 10.

[75]Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, Faculty Tenure, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1973), p. 23.

[76]Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[77]Footnote omitted.

[78]"High Court in N.J.Upholds State's Tenure Restrictions," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (April 1, 1974), p. 3.

[79]Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education, Governance (Organization and Administration), op. cit., pp. 52 ff.

[80]Victor G. Rosenblum, "Legal Dimensions of Tenure," Faculty Tenure, op. cit., p. 161.

[81]Cf. "Fact Sheet #12," Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service (February, 1975), p. 3.

[82]Cf. Education Commission of the States, A Legislator's Guide to Collective Bargaining in Education. (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1975), pp. vi-ix.

[83]"Faculty Unions and Governance," Chronicle of Higher Education, X (March 17, 1975), p. 1.

[84]Phillip W. Semas, "Laws on Faculty Bargaining," Chronicle of Higher Education, X (March 31, 1975), p. 8.

[85]M.M. Chambers, "Who Is the University," Journal of Higher Education, XXX (June, 1959), p. 324.

[86]Malcolm G. Scully, "Many Trustees Seek to Assert More Control," Chronicle of Higher Education VIII (May 6, 1974), pp. 1, 2.

[87]T.R. McConnell, The Redistribution of Power in Higher Education: Changing Patterns of Governance (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971), pp. 38-40.

[88]Academy for Educational Development, State Planning for Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1969), p. 5.

[89]Robert O. Berdahl, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971), p. 4.

[90]Harold W. Dodds, The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), p. 15.

[91]Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education, Governance (Organization and Administration, op. cit., pp. 76 ff.

[92]John W. Gardner, "The Antileadership Vaccine," Reprinted from Annual Report of Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1965, pp. 11-12.

[93]Ian E. McNett, "A New Style of Leadership Is Emerging As 'Crisis Managers' Confront the 1970's," Chronicle of Higher Education, IV (July 6, 1970), pp. 1, 2.

[94]Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1947), p. 162.

[95]Samuel Baskin (ed.), Higher Education: Some Newer Developments (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), pp. 318-332.

[96]Ernest L. Boyer, "Breaking the Youth Ghetto," Lifelong Learners--A New Clientele for Higher Education, edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1974), pp. 5-6.

[97]Cf. Ann Heiss, An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform (Berkeley: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973).

[98]Carol H. Shulman, Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects, op. cit., p. 1.

[99]Larry A. Van Dyne, "Experimental Colleges: Uneasy Freedom, Mind-Bending Strains--and Hope," Chronicle of Higher Education, VI (May 15, 1972), p. 4.

[100]Peter Bloch and Nancy Nylen, "Hampshire College: New Intents and Old Realities," Change, 6 (October, 1974), p. 39.

[101]Randall P. Kunkel, "A Study of the Maintenance and Alteration of Policies and Practices in Selected Innovative Institutions of Higher Education," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Univeristy of Denver, 1973, pp. 198 ff.

[102]Robert A. Altman, The Upper Division College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970), p. 76.

[103]Resources for the Future, op. cit., p. 16.

[104]Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education (A Review of Recent Literature), No. 4 Instructional Programs, pp. 46 ff.

[105]Malcolm G. Scully, "Student Focus on Practicality Hits Humanities," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (February 4, 1974), pp. 1, 3.

[106]Resources for the Future, op. cit., p. 29.

[107]Virginia B. Smith, "College Finances: Ills and Remedies," Research Report No. 4, American Association for Higher Education (February 15, 1971), p. 2.

[108]William G. Bowen, The Economics of the Major Private Universities (Berkeley: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1968), pp. 3-4.

[109]"Average College Deficit Increases Five-Fold in Year," Chronicle of Higher Education, V (January 11, 1971), pp. 1, 8.

[110]Robert L. Jacobson, "Gifts to Colleges Dip, First Time in Ten Years," Chronicle of Higher Education, V (April 5, 1971), p. 1.

[111]"Private Giving to Universities Breaks Record," Chronicle of Higher Education, VI (April 10, 1972), p. 1, 5.

[112]Robert L. Jacobson, "Control of Cost Found Saving Many Colleges," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (April 16, 1973), p. 1.

[113]Beverly T. Watkins, "Some Private Colleges Say Worst Is Over, Fiscally; Others Gloomy; Many State Campuses Feel Pinch," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (September 24, 1973), pp. 1, 7.

[114]"Inflation Held Masking Some Colleges 'Troubles,'" Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (April 15, 1974), p. 3.

[115]Jack Magarrell, "'Chrunch' Coming, Private Institutions Warned," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (May 20, 1974), p. 5.

[116]Cheryl M. Fields, "No General Crisis, No Need for General Aid, Panel Told," Chronicle of Higher Education, V (May 3, 1971), p. 2.

[117]Committee for Economic Development, The Management and Financing of Colleges (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1973), pp. 12-13.

[118]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay? (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973).

[119]Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education (A Review of Recent Literature), No. 5 Financing the Program.

[120]"Cost of College Rises 40 Pct. in Four Years," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (March 25, 1974), p. 1. Cf. Also, Malcolm G. Scully, "College-Going: Costlier Next Fall, Survey Indicates 12-pct. Average Increase at Public Institutions, 8-pct. at Private," Chronicle of Higher Education, X (March 31, 1975), p. 1.

[121]Cheryl M. Fields, "Cutting Tuition in Half: Wisconsin Plan Under Political Attack," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (October 29, 1974), p. 7.

[122]William G. Bowen, The Economics of the Major Private Universities, op. cit., pp. 36-39.

[123]Malcolm G. Scully, "How Much Can Parents Pay?" Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (September 23, 1974), p. 2.

[124]Karen J. Winkler, "Student Defaults on Loans Prove Costly to U.S.," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (February 11, 1974), pp. 1, 5.

[125]Karen J. Winkler, "Defaults Up: Failure of Students to Repay Guaranteed Loans May Cost the Government $508-Million," Chronicle of Higher Education IX (September 30, 1974), p. 7.

[126]Karen J. Winkler, "Student Loan Outlook: Partly Sunny," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (October 29, 1974), p. 3.

[127]"Higher Education's Share of U.S. Budgets," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (February 10, 1975), p. 6.

[128]Karen J. Winkler, "A $2 Billion Aid Gap," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (November 4, 1974), p. 5.

[129]"Higher Education's Share of U.S. Budget," op. cit.

[130]National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 88.

[131]John A. Crowl, "13 More States Move to Help Private Colleges," Chronicle of Higher Education, VI (October 18, 1971), p. 1.

[132]Larry A. Van Dyne, "States Double Scholarship Aid Over 2 Years," Chronicle of Higher Education, VI (February 7, 1972), p. 1.

[133]National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, op. cit., p. 97.

[134]Ibid., p. 101.

[135]Allan O. Pfnister, Trends in American Higher Education, Financing the Program, op. cit.

[136]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education: Who Pays? Who Benefits? Who Should Pay?, op. cit., p. 9.

[137]Cf. Carol H. Shulman, Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects, op. cit., p. 30.

[138]Howard R. Bowen, "Financing Higher Education: The Current State of the Debate," Higher Education, Human Resources and the National Economy (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974), pp. 27-28.

[139]William McNamara, "The O'Hara Curriculum," Change, 6 (December-January, 1974-75), p. 48.

[140] Jack Magarrell, "How Firm the Foundations?" Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (September 30, 1974), p. 1.

[141]Malcoml G. Scully, "Corporations' Unrestricted Gifts to Universities Stir New Debate," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (November 12, 1973), p. 1.

[142]Roger Ricklefs, "Squeezed for Money, A Number of Colleges Revamp Curriculums," Wall Street Journal, XCII (February 18, 1975, pp. 1, 24.

[143]"Colleges Go into Business to Make Ends Meet," U.S. News and World Report, (January 27, 1975), p. 33.

[144]Howard R. Bowen, "Financing Higher Education: The Current State of the Debate," op. cit., p. 36.

[145]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The More Effective Use of Resources (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972), pp. 16-18.

[146]James Harvey, "College and University Planning," Financing Higher Education: College and University Planning, ERIC Research Reports (Washington, D.C.: ACPRR, 1971), pp. 22-33.

[147]Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, op. cit., p. 321.

[148]Cf. Howard R. Bowen and Gordon K. Douglass, Efficiency in Liberal Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971).

[149]Charles S. Benson and Harold L. Hodgkinson, Implementing the Learning Society (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974).

[150]Earl F. Cheit, The New Depression in Higher Education - Two Years Later (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 15.

[151]Ibid., p. 64.

[152]Ibid., p. 66.

[153]Ibid., p. 67.